

THE
CATHOLIC DOCTRINE
OF A
TRINITY,

PROVED BY

Above an Hundred short and clear Arguments, expressed
in the Terms of the

HOLY SCRIPTURE,

COMPARED AFTER A MANNER ENTIRELY NEW,
AND

Digested under the four following TITLES,

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1. The Divinity of <i>Christ</i> . | 3. The <i>Plurality</i> of Persons. |
| 2. The Divinity of the <i>Holy Ghost</i> . | 4. The <i>Trinity</i> in Unity. |

With a few Reflections, occasionally interspersed, upon
some of the *Arian* Writers, particularly

Dr. S. CLARKE.

To which also is prefixed,

A *Discourse* to the Reader, on the necessity of Faith in the
true God, and upon *Diversity of Opinion*.

By the Reverend WILLIAM JONES,

Late of University College in *Oxford*,

Author of a full *Answer* to an *Essay on Spirit*.

Thou shalt answer for me, O Lord my God. Psal. xxxviii. 15.
Not in the words which mans wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost
teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

1 Cor. ii. 13.

DUBLIN:

Printed for R. and E. MATURINE, and H. and E.
Mc. MAHON, Stephen-Street.

M,DCC,LXXVI.

Imprimatur,

GEO. HUDDSFORD,

Vice-Can. Oxon.

May 21, 1756.

TO THE
REVEREND AND WORTHY
THE VICE-CHANCELLOR,

THE HEADS OF HOUSES,

AND OTHER MEMBERS OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD;

THE FOLLOWING DEFENCE

OF THE

DOCTRINE OF THE EVER-BLESSED TRINITY,

IS MOST RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY

THE AUTHOR.

A 2

TO THE

MEMBERS OF THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

OF THE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

IN RELATION TO THE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

AND

THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

AND THE PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK

BY

THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

To the R E A D E R.

THE Christian Religion is best known and distinguished by the *God* proposed in it, as the object of our faith and obedience: and as there is no true religion, but the religion of Christians, so is there no true God, but the God of Christians.

Before the coming of *Christ*, and the fulfilling of the Law, God was known by the name of *Jehovah*, the God of *Abraham*, and of *Isaac*, and of *Jacob*. The *Israelites*, who were the seed of *Abraham*, and drew their whole religion from a divine revelation, had the knowledge of the true God; and the people of every other nation, who were *aliens from the commonwealth of Israel*, and *strangers from the covenants of promise*, were also, *without God in the World*^a. Though they talked much of God, and wrote much of him, and offered him many sacrifices, yet they knew him not: the Being they served, was not God, but another in the place of him, falsely called by his name. And though some modern Christians have forgot there was any Difference, yet the very *heathens* themselves, upon some occasions, were ready enough to allow it. *Naaman* the *Syrian*, when he was cured of his leprosy by the Prophet *Elisha*, made a public confession of it—*Behold, now I know that there is no God in all the earth, but in Israel*^b. The same is affirmed by the inspired Psalmist—*All the Gods of the heathen are idols*^c; and God himself declares them all to have been *vanities*^d.

The case is now with the *Christians* under the Gospel, as it anciently was with the *Jews* under the Law: they believe in the only true God; while the unchristian part of Mankind, who are by far the majority, either know him not, or wilfully deny him; as *Pharaoh* did the *God of the Hebrews* when he was told of him. And we are now got to such a pitch of indevotion and ignorance, that among

A 3

those

^a *Eph.* II. 12. ^b *2 Kings* V. 15. ^c *Psal.* XCVI. 5. ^d *Jer.* XIV. 22.

those who profess and call themselves *Christians*, there are too many, who are almost come to be *Heathens* without knowing it. For there is a fashionable notion, propagated by most of our moral writers, and readily subscribed to by those who say their prayers but seldom, and can never find time to read their Bible, that all who worship any God, worship the *same* God; as if we worshipped the three Letters of the *word* God, instead of the *Being* meant and understood by it. The *universal Prayer* of Mr. A—P— was composed upon this plan; wherein the supreme Being is addressed as a common *Father of all*, under the names, *Jehovah*, *Jove*, and *Lord*. And this humour of confounding things, which ought to be distinguished at the peril of our Souls, and of comprehending *Believers* and *Idolaters* under one and the same religion, is called a *catholic Spirit*, that shews the very exaltation of Christian Charity. But God, it is to be feared, will require an account of it under another name; and though the *Poet* could see no difference, but has mistaken *Jove* or *Jupiter* for the same *Father of all* with the *Lord Jehovah*; yet the *Apostle* has instructed us better; who, when the *Priest of Jupiter* came to offer sacrifice, exhorted him very passionately to *turn from those vanities unto the living God*^b; well knowing that he whom the *Priest* adored under the name of *Jupiter*, was not the *living God*, but a creature, a nothing, a *vanity*. Yet the catholic Spirit of a moralist can discern no difference; and while it pretends some zeal for a sort of universal religion, common to *believers* and *infidels*, betrays a sad indifference for the Christian religion in particular. This error is so monstrous in a land enlightened by the Gospel, and yet so very common amongst us at present, that I may be pardoned for speaking of it in the manner it deserves. And let me beseech every serious person, who is willing to have his prayers heard, to consider this matter a little better, and use a more correct form; for God, who is jealous of his honour, and has no communion with idols, will certainly reject the petition that sets him upon a level with *Baal* and *Jupiter*.

The

The *true God* is He that was in *Christ reconciling the world to himself*; there is none other but He; and if this great Characteristic be denied, or any other assumed in its stead, a man is left *without God*; after which, he may call himself a *Deist*, if he will; but his God is a mere idol of the imagination, and has no corresponding reality in the whole universe of beings.

The modern *Jews*, by denying their *God* to have been *manifest in the flesh*, are as effectually departed from the *true God* as their forefathers were, when they danced before the golden calf, and called their idolatrous service *a feast to the Lord*. For the Being of God is not an object of sight, but of faith; it enters first into the heart; and if it be wrong there, the *first* commandment is broken: if a figure of it be set up before the eyes, then the *second* is broken likewise. The first forbids us to *have* any other God; the second to make any graven *image* of him. Now though we make no image, yet if with the heart we *believe* in any God, different from the true, the Idolatry indeed may be less, but the Apostacy is the same. And this seems to be the case of the *Jew*.

The *Mahometans* are another set of infidels who *abhor idols*, but have in express terms denied the *Son of God*, and set up an idol of the imagination, a God in *one Person*. They inveigh bitterly against the *Christians* for worshipping *three Gods*; for so they state the doctrine of a Trinity in *Unity*, as some others have done beside them.

In answer to all these abominations of the *Deist*, the *Jew*, and the *Mahometan*, and to shew that no unbeliever of any denomination can be a servant of the *true God*, it is written—*whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father*^b: and again—*whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not GOD*^c. And let the *Socinians*, who have not only vindicated the Religion of *Mahomet*, but preferred it to the Christianity of the Church of England, which with them is *no better nor other than a*

A 4

sort

^b 1 John II. 23.^c 2 John 9.

*sort of Paganism and Heathenism**, let them consider what a share they have in this condemnation.

And to bring this matter home to the *Arians*, it is to be observed that every article of the Christian Faith, depends upon the Doctrine of a Trinity in Unity. If that be given up, the other doctrines of our religion must go with it, and so it has been in fact, that the authors who have written against the Trinity, have also disputed away some other essential parts of Christianity; particularly the doctrines of the *Satisfaction* and of *original sin*.

The whole Bible treats of little else but our *creation, redemption, sanctification, resurrection* and *glorification* by the power of *Christ* and the *Holy Spirit*: and the reader will find hereafter, that there is neither name, act, nor attribute of the Godhead, that is not shared in common by all the persons of the Trinity. If, therefore, the persons of *Christ* and the *Spirit* are not *God* in the Unity of the *Father*, then the prayers and praises we offer to them, as the authors of every blessing, will not be directed to the supreme Lord and God, beside whom no other is to be *worshipped*, but to his creatures and instruments: which overthrows the sense of our whole religion; and drives us upon a sort of second rate faith and worship, which, beside the blasphemy of it, can be nothing but confusion and contradiction. It is no wonder then, that the *Arians* and *Socinians*, with their several under-sects and divisions, who have fallen into this snare, and departed from the divine *Unity*, while they pretend to be the only men who assert it, have never yet been able to agree in the forms of religious worship: some of them allowing that *Christ* is to receive divine worship, but always with this reserve, that the

* See *Leslie's Theological works*, Fol. Vol. 1. p. 218. where the reader may find a great deal more to the same purpose; and particularly an Epistle of the *Socinians* to the *Morocco* Embassador, in the time of *Charles II.* a great curiosity, wherein their whole scheme is laid open to the bottom by themselves.

the Prayer tend ultimately to the person of *the Father*. So that *Christ* is to be worshipped, only he is not to be worshipped: and if you should venture, when you are at the point of death, to say with St. *Stephen*—Lord Jesus, *receive my Spirit*^b—and confess the person of *Jesus* to be *the God of the Spirits of all flesh*,^c by committing your own Spirit into his hands; you are to take care not to die without throwing in some qualifying comment, to assure him you do it only in hypocrisy, not meaning him but another. Others again, knowing this distinction to be vain and indefensible, and the same for substance with the *Latria* and *Dulia* by which the Church of *Rome* excuses her adoration of the *blest Virgin*, &c. have fairly got rid of it, by denying to the person of *Christ* any divine worship or invocation at all; which is the case with our *Socinian Unitarians* here in *England*; for those of *Poland* are quite of another mind.

How far such differences as these must needs affect a *Liturgy*, it is very easy to foresee: and that it will for ever be as impossible to frame a Creed or a Service to please all those who bear the name of *Christians*, as to make a coat that shall fit men of all sizes. * *Prayer* and divine *worship* and religious *confession*, are the fruit and breath of *Faith*; and out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh^d: so that until we are agreed in matters of *faith*, there is neither hope nor possibility of our agreeing in any form of *worship*.

^b *Acts* VII. 59.

^c *Num.* XVI. 22.

* *Hales* of *Eton*, in his sarcastic and malicious tract upon *Schism*, proposes it as a grand expedient for the advancing of *Unity*, that we should “consider of all the *Liturgies*, that are “and ever have been; and remove from them whatever is “scandalous to any party, and leave nothing but what *all* “agree on.” He should have closed this sentence a little sooner, and advised us fairly and honestly to *leave nothing*; for that will certainly be the event, when the objections of *all parties* are suffered to prevail: there being no one page of the *Liturgy*, wherein *all*, who pretend to worship God as *Christians* are agreed.

^d *Matth.* XII. 34.

worship. God is the fountain head, and religion the stream, that descends from it. Our sentiments as to religion, always flow from the opinion we have formed of the divine nature; and will be right or wrong, sweet or bitter, as the fountain is from whence they are derived. It is the having a different God, that makes a different religion. A true God produces a true religion; a false God, a false religion. *Jews, Turks, Pagans, Deists, Arians, Socinians, and Christians*, all differ about a religion, because they differ about a God.

These few observations will be sufficient, I hope, to raise the attention of the reader; and persuade him, that a right faith in God is a much more serious affair than some would make it; that it is of the last concern, and hath a necessary influence upon the practice and holiness of our lives; that as no other devotion is acceptable with God, but that which is seasoned with love and charity and uniformity, the very mark and badge whereby his disciples are to be known from the men of this world, it is the principal duty of every *Christian* to know in *whom* he ought to *believe*, that *with one mind and one mouth we may glorify God*^b: for a right notion of God, will as surely be followed by a sound faith and an uniform profession in all other points; as a false faith and a discordant worship will grow from every wrong opinion of him.

All that can be known of the true God, is to be known by *Revelation*. The false lights indeed of reason and nature are set up and recommended, as necessary to assist and ratify the evidence of Revelation: but enquiries of this kind, as they are now managed, generally end in the degradation of *Christ* and the Christian Religion†: till it can be shewn therefore, that the Scripture neither does nor can shine by a light and authority of *its own*, the evidence we
are

^b *Rom. XV. 6.*

† You may have a proof of this from the *Essay on Spirit*, by comparing the Book with its *title*, which runs thus—*The Doctrine of the Trinity considered in the Light of Reason and Nature, &c.*

are to rest in, must be drawn from thence; and as we all have the same scripture, without doubt we ought all to have the same opinion of God.

But here it is commonly objected, that men will be of different opinions; that they have a right to judge for themselves; and that when the best evidence the nature of the case will admit of is collected and laid before them, they must determine upon it *as it appears to them*, and according to the *light of their own consciences*: so that if they adhere as closely to their errors after they have consulted the proper evidence as they did before, we are neither to wonder nor to be troubled at it.

This very moderate and benevolent way of thinking, has been studiously recommended by those, who found it necessary to the well-being of their own opinions, that not a spark of zeal should be left amongst us. And surely it is no new thing, that the advocates of any particular error, next to themselves and their own fashion, should naturally incline to those who are softest and stand least in the way. Hence it is, that however magisterial and insolent they may carry themselves in their own cause, they always take care to season their writings with the praises of this frozen indifference; calling that *Christian* charity, which is nothing but the absence of Christianity: and any the least appearance of earnestness for some great and valuable truth, which we are unwilling to part with, because we hope to be saved by it, is brow-beaten, condemned, and cast out of their moral system, under the name of *heat, want of temper, fire, fury, &c.* They add moreover, that articles of faith are Things merely *speculative*; and that it is of little signification what a man *believes*, if he is but hearty and *sincere* in it: that is, in other words, it is a mere trifle whether we feed upon bread^{*} or poison^b; the one will prove to be as good nourishment as the other; provided it be eaten with an appetite. Yet some well meaning people are so puzzled

* See and compare *Deut. VIII. 3. Amos VIII. 11. Acts XX. 28.*

^b *Jam. III. 8.*

¹ *Tim. IV. 1.*

puzzled and deceived by this sophistry, that they look upon concord among *Christians* as a thing impracticable and desperate; concluding a point to be *disputable* because it is *disputed*; and so they fall into a loose indifferent humour of palliating and thinking charitably, as it is called, of every error in faith and in practice; as if the Church of *Christ* might very innocently be turned into a *Babel* of confusion.

Now that men do maintain opinions strangely different from one another, especially on subjects wherein it most concerns them to be agreed, is readily confessed: we are all witnesses of it: and, allowing them to be equally informed, there are but three possible sources from whence this difference can arise. It must be either from God, or from the scripture, or from themselves. From God it cannot be, for it is a great evil; it is the triumph of Deists and reprobates, and the best handle the enemies of Christianity ever found against it: and God is not the author of evil. Nor can it be from the scripture: to draw it thence, is but another way of imputing it to God. The scripture is his word; and he is answerable for the effect of his words when written or reported, as when they are suggested at first hand by the voice of his Holy Spirit. It remains therefore, that the only source of this evil must be the heart of man: and that it really is so, will be evident from the scripture, and the plainest matters of fact. The account we have of this affair is, in short, as follows—Ever since the *fall*, the nature of man has been blind and corrupt; his *understanding darkened*^b, and his affections polluted: upon the face of the whole earth there is no man, *Jew or Gentile*, that *understandeth and seeketh after God*^c; the *natural man*, or man remaining in that state wherein the fall left him, is so far from being able to discover or know any religious truth, that he hates and flies from it when it is proposed to him; he *receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God*^d. Man is natural and earthly; the things of God are spiritual and heavenly; and these are contrary one to the

^b Eph. IV. 18. ^c Rom. III. 11. ^d 1 Cor. II. 14.

the other : therefore as the *wisdom of this world is foolishness with God*^d, so the wisdom of God is foolishness with the world. In a word, the sense man is now possessed of, where God does not restrain it, is used for evil and not for good : his *wisdom is earthly, sensual, †, devilish*^e; it is the sagacity of a brute^f, animated by the malignity of an evil Spirit.

This being the present state of man, the Scripture does therefore declare it necessary, that he should be *transformed by the renewing of his mind*^g, and restored to that *sound mind*^h, and *light of the understanding*ⁱ, that *spiritual discernment*^k, with which the human nature was endued when it came from the hands of God, but to which it has been *dead* from the day that evil was brought into the world. And where the grace of God that should open the eyes, and prepare the heart to receive instruction^l, has been obstinately withstood and resisted; this blindness, which at first was only *natural*, becomes *judicial*; from being a defect, it is confirmed into a judgment; and men are not only unable to discern the truth, but are settled and riveted in error : which is the case with all those to whom *God sends strong delusion that they should believe a lie, and have pleasure in unrighteousness*^m. It is then they sit down in the *seat of the scornful*, as *fools that make a mock at sin*ⁿ, and *despisers of those that are good*^o; hating and railing at their fellow creatures, only because they are endued with the fear of God! This is the last stage of blindness: and it is referred to in those words of the Apostle—*If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost*^p : as also in that lamentation of our blessed Lord over the City of *Jerusalem*—*If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day,*
the

^d Cor. III. 19.

† *φύσιον*, natural.

^e Jam. III. 15.

^f Jude 10.

^g Rom. XII. 2.

^h 2 Tim. I. 7.

ⁱ Eph. I. 18.

^k 1 Cor. II. 14.

^l Prov. XX. 12. and XVI. 1.

^m 2 Thess. II. 11.

ⁿ Prov. XIV. 9.

^o 2 Tim. III. 3.

^p 2 Cor. IV. 3.

the things that belong to thy peace ! but now they are hid from thine Eyes. ^c

The absolute necessity of God's grace to *lighten our darkness*, should be largely, faithfully and constantly insisted upon by the writers and preachers of the Church of *England* : but since a Spirit of *Deism* has crept in among us, it has been openly slighted and contemned by some, and too much neglected by others ; which has given an opportunity to several sorts of Enthusiasts to make a wrong use of it, viz. *Methodists* and *Quakers* : and as the writers of the Church, or at least some of them, have not brought out to view this great truth so often as it should have been, it has been taken up by others (as all *tares* are sown while the husbandmen are *asleep*) and employed, under some false state of it, to the no small disadvantage of the Church and the Christian Religion.

To illustrate this subject, I shall make it appear by a few plain examples, that where mankind have been divided in their opinions with regard to any divine truth, it has not been owing to the ambiguity of its terms, or the defect of its evidence, but wholly and solely to the state and temper of the hearers. And thus *Christ* himself has instructed us in his parable of the *sower* ; that where the good seed of the world perishes, it is to be imputed to the *ground* and not to the *seed*. How else can we account for it, that when *St. Paul* laid the evidence of the Gospel before a large assembly of *Jews* at *Rome*, *some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not* ^d ; though the same things were spoken to all ? Such in general was the success of the Apostolical preaching ; some few *receiving the word with gladness*, while others opposed themselves and blasphemed. And though it be supposed, that *words* are more easily misunderstood than *facts*, and may admit of a greater latitude, yet *here* we shall find, that the same spirit which has divided mankind in what are called the more speculative points of faith, will also divide them in the plainest and most striking matters of fact. The resurrection of *Lazarus* was a
matter

^c *Luke XIX. 42.*

^d *Acts XXVIII. 24.*

matter of fact, seen and attested by a competent number of witnesses but how different was the effect of it upon different persons! for while it had its free course with many of the *Jews*, and moved them to *believe on Jesus*, it only moved *the chief Priests* to hate him the more; and they consulted how *they might put Lazarus also to death*^b. When *Jesus* cured the blind and cast out devils, some rightly concluded—*Rabbi, thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou dost, except God be with him*^c: yet there were not a few, and they of the most learned and knowing too, who concluded far otherwise, that he *cast out devils by Beelzebub the prince of the devils*^d. So likewise, when the Holy Ghost descended on the Apostles, and inspired them with the gift of tongues, some *devout men* were amazed and confounded at the miracle; plainly seeing the hand of God in it, and asking what it *meant*, what was the end and design of it? and being informed by St. *Peter's* discourse that it was to confirm the mission of *Jesus of Nazareth, received his word gladly, and were baptized*^e; while *others*, to avoid the conclusion, *mocking said, these men are full of new wine*^f. Here is a great multitude assembled together; all of them witnesses to the same fact: yet, in their *opinions* of it, they are as far asunder as drunkenness is from inspiration. But in this case no Christian will raise a doubt about the *real* inspiration of the Apostles; or deny the power of God to have been sufficiently manifested, because some were so prophane and senseless as to ridicule it under the name of drunkenness.

This self-deceit always operates by the assistance of some false principle contrary to the scripture; which gets possession of the heart by ministering to the passions. And till that be dispossessed, no truth will be suffered to enter, which can in the least affect or destroy it. A man in such circumstances may see the truth staring him in the face; and the clearer he sees it, the more he will be enraged at it.
He

^b *John* XII. 10, 11. ^c *Ibid.* III. 2. ^d *Matth.* XII. 24.
^e *Acts* II. 41. ^f *Ibid.* v. 13.

He may be convicted, and left without a word to say, but what will expose the hardness and perplexity of his heart; but till it be emptied of its evil treasure, and he becomes as a little child, that has nothing of *its own* to oppose the Revelation of God, he cannot be *converted*: but will either shut his eyes and deny the evidence that is offered to him, or pretend it is a *nice point*, very difficult to be understood; and so give a perverse turn to it, though it be ever so plain and intelligible.

Till the Disciples of *Christ* resigned themselves up to be led into all truth by the teaching of the Holy Spirit, they were in the state of mind I am now describing; dull of hearing, and doubtful, and slow of heart. They were often warned of it; particularly in the following words—*I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot BEAR them now*^b. And as the divine wisdom made choice of such men for the good of those who should come after, so these things are written of them for our admonition. They had laid it down as a first principle, that their master's kingdom was to be *of this world*; and formed all their reasonings and expectations accordingly. One was to *sit at his right hand*, another *at his left*; and they were ever disputing which should be *the greatest*. Any occurrence that flattered this notion, was gladly received and made the most of; and every thing that could not be reconciled with it was thrust out of sight. When *the son of man* began to teach them, that he must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again^c; all these things were so destructive of their principle, that *Peter* began to rebuke him, as if he had heard blasphemy. *Christ* took an opportunity of inculcating this doctrine afresh, when they were in a state of conviction at seeing him perform a miracle; endeavouring, as it were to surprize them into a confession of its truth: but the time was not yet.—*While they wondered every one at all things which Jesus did, he said unto his disciples, let these sayings sink down into your ears:*

^b John XVI. 12.

^c Mark VIII. 31.

ears : for the son of man shall be delivered into the hands of men. But they understood not this saying ; it was hid from them, that they perceived it not ^b. The terms were clear and intelligible enough ; and the ideas conveyed by them were all common and familiar : but if that saying were admitted, they must part with their beloved principle, therefore it follows, that *they were afraid to ask him of that saying* ; lest he should carry on the subject, and leave them no way to escape. They had already heard more than they would believe, and therefore, as to any thing farther, thought it best to remain in the dark.

In short, where there is a taste and relish for *the things that be of men*, more than for *the things that be of God*, and some principle is imbibed wherein the passions are strongly engaged, men are to be persuaded of any thing and of nothing : ready to take up with every despicable pretence, to prop and support their favourite opinion, and deaf to the plainest words and most infallible proofs, if they tend to establish the other side of the question. For example ; that a *Messiah* was to deliver their nation, was allowed by all the *Jews* ; and they were well agreed as to the time of his coming, and the place where he should be born. It was to be shewn, that *Jesus of Nazareth* was the person : and for a proof of it, they were bid to compare the scripture with the things he did and taught. *But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him* ^c ; and as if he had left the proof of his mission obscure and defective, they came very formally to him to *ask a sign of him*, after they had seen so many signs ; and called out to the very last for better evidence, bidding him *come down from the Cross*, that they might see and believe ^d. One would take these *Jews* to have been *Sceptics*, who would persevere in their doubtings against every proposition that could be offered. But if we judge from their behaviour upon some other occasions, there never was a more credulous generation upon the face of the earth. They could receive full satisfaction from the most childish and in-

B

consistent

^b Luke IX. 43, 44. ^c John XII. 37. ^d Mark XV. 32.

consistent tales that ever were invented. The self-contradiction of *Satan casting out Satan*; or the report of a few heathen soldiers, who witnessed what was done *while they were asleep*, could pass for good gospel; while the most evident miracles, and the clearest prophecies, were all nothing to the purpose, where they did not like the conclusion. And for the same reason, the whole gospel itself, while it is the favour of life to some, is a favour of death to others: as different as life and death! yet nevertheless one and the same gospel. It is like the pillar that stood between the camp of *Israel* and the host of *Egypt*; which was a *cloud* to the one, and *light* to the other^b. But who will deny that the light was clear to the *Israelites*, because the *Egyptians* saw nothing but a cloud of darkness?

Behold then the true source of all our religious differences: they proceed from the blindness and corruption of the human heart, encreased and cherished by some false principle that suits with its appetites; and all the prudence and learning the world can boast, will exempt no child of *Adam* from this miserable weakness; nothing but the grace of God can possibly remove it. Where that is suffered to enter, and the heart, instead of persisting in its own will, is surrendered to the will of God, the whole Gospel is sufficiently clear, because no text of it is any longer offensive.

Of this happy change we have the best example in the apostles of our blessed *Saviour*; who when they first entered the School of Christianity, had a veil upon their hearts like the rest of their countrymen, and were strongly possessed by a spirit of the World, promising itself the full enjoyment of temporal honours and preferments. But the sufferings and death of their master having shewed the vanity of such expectations, and served in a great measure to beat down this earthly principle, they were ready for conviction; and then *their understanding was opened, that they might understand the Scriptures*^c. The evidence that before was dark and inconclusive, became on a sudden clear and irresistible; and they, who lately fled from disgrace

^b *Exod.* XIV. 20.

^c *Luke* XXIV. 45.

grace and death as from the greatest of evils, could now rejoice that they were found worthy to suffer. Their opinion was altered, because their affections were cleansed from this world: that mire and clay was washed off from their eyes in the true waters of *Siloam*, and now they could see all things clearly.

What has been here said upon the conduct of our *Saviour's* disciples and the unbelieving *Jews*, may be applied to all those who dispute any article of the *Christian Faith*; and particularly the doctrine of the *ever-blessed Trinity*, as revealed to us in the holy scriptures. For we shall certainly find, that some false principle is assumed, which flatters the pride of human nature. It abhors restraint and subjection; and is ever aspiring, right or wrong, to be distinguished from the common herd, and to exalt itself against the knowledge of God^b. What this principle is, we shall very soon discover: it is publickly owned and gloried in by every considerable writer that of late years has meddled with this subject. I shall instance in the learned *Dr. Clarke*; because he is deservedly placed at the head of the *Arian* disputants in this kingdom.

He affirms in his first *Proposition*, that the ONE GOD, spoken of in *Matth.* xix. 17. and elsewhere, is only one PERSON; and then adds "This is the first principle of natural Religion."*

So then here are two different religions; by one of which it is proved, that the one God is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that he is therefore three persons. But it is the first principle of the other religion, that he is but one person: though how that can be reconciled with the practice of the whole heathen world, who were so far from discovering this one person, that they held Gods many and Lords many^c, is not very easy to determine. And whence comes this Religion? it is confessed to be drawn from nature! it is the Gospel of the natural man, unsanctified by divine grace, and uninstructed by any light from

B 2
above;

^b 2 Cor. X. 5.

^c 1 Cor. VIII. 5.

* See *Script. Doct.* p. II. §. I.

above; and owes its birth to that fountain of darkness and self-conceit, from whence has sprang all the confusion and imagination that ever was introduced into the religion of God. And what wonder, if *nature* should operate as strongly in an *Arian* or a *Socinian* against the mystery of the *Trinity*, as it did in the *Jews* against the *Law* and the *Prophets*, and in the unconverted disciples against the doctrine of the *Cross*? If it be laid down as a *first principle*, that God is but *one person*; then it will be utterly impossible, so long as this principle keeps possession, that any person, of common sense enough to know the meaning of words, should quietly receive and embrace a Revelation in those parts of it, where it teaches us that God is *three Persons*: these two principles being so diametrically opposite, that while he holds to the one, a voice from the dead will not persuade him of the other.

What then will be the consequence in this case? The practice of the *Deist*, who carries on this argument to its proper issue, is to *deny* the Scripture-revelation, because his *natural Religion* is contrary to it; and they cannot both be true. But the partial unbeliever, who allows the Scripture to be supported by such external evidence as he cannot answer, while his Reason objects to the matter contained in it, must follow the example of the *Jews*, and *reconcile* the Scripture where he cannot *believe* it. Thus they treated the law of *Moses*. *We know*, said they, *that God spake unto Moses*^b: therefore they readily granted his Law to have a divine authority; but as it would not serve their turn in its own proper words, they put a false gloss of tradition upon the face of it, to hide its true complexion; and then complained that the Scripture was not clear enough: and if you used it as a testimony to *Jesus Christ*, they would stone you for a *blasphemer*.

What shall we say then? that the *Jews* were of a *different opinion* from the *Christians*? and that this was *their way* of *understanding* the Scripture? No: God forbid. For, if we will believe the Scripture itself, it was their way

^b *John* ix. 29.

way of *denying* it. *Had ye BELIEVED* Moses, says our Lord, *ye would have believed me*: and he gives us upon this occasion, the true grounds and reasons for their unbelief; because they *received honour one of another*, and had not the *love of God* in them^b. Every hypothesis of human growth, which was pretty sure to agree with their complexion, and reflected some honour upon themselves by exalting the human nature of man, that can make a *religion for itself*, and comes in its *own name*; *that* they would gladly *receive*. But if any thing was offered to them in the name of God, to be received for the love of him, and the spiritual comfort of a pure conscience, and the hope of a better world; it was rejected, as an encroachment upon their *natural rights*, and an invective against the innocent pleasures of a carnal *Jerusalem*. And so it is with us at this time: for if an author hangs out the Sign of *Nature and Reason* in his title-page, there are readers in plenty, who will buy up and swallow his dregs by wholesale: but if God, of his infinite mercy and condescension, shews to them the *way of Salvation*, his words are to be abstracted from the evidence upon which he requires us to believe them, then put into this Alembec of *reason*, and demonstrated to be no *poison*, before they can be brought to taste them. And if they should happen to be a little disagreeable to flesh and blood, and the operation should miscarry, the fault is charged upon God, and not upon themselves, who ought to have gone another way to work; as they will certainly find.

We conclude therefore, because *Christ* has affirmed it, that every degree of doubt and disputation against the words of God, is just so much *unbelief*; proceeding not from the head or understanding, but from the heart^c and affections. And the world is filled with the vain jangling of uncertainty, for this short reason—*all men have not Faith*^d.

^b See *John* V. 39.—*ad fin.*

^c *Heb.* III. 12.

^d *2 Thess.* III. 2.

ADVERTISEMENT.

IN all the *Texts* which are compared together in the following work, those particular words, whereon the stress of the comparison lies, are printed in *Capitals*; that the argument obtained from them may shew itself to the reader upon the first inspection. And, I hope, after what has been observed to him in the foregoing discourse, that this is the only admonition he will stand in need of. The arguments I have drawn from the scriptures are, to the best of my knowledge, most of them new: and, if I may judge from my own mind, the manner in which they are laid down, is more likely to convince, than any I have yet seen. Had I thought otherwise, I could easily have forbore to trouble myself or the world with the transcribing and printing them. The end I have proposed is not to obtain any reputation, (to which this is not the way) but to do some little good, of which there is much need. I do therefore sincerely recommend the following work, and every Reader of it, to the grace and blessing of Almighty God; well knowing, that *unless the Lord keep the City, the watchman waketh but in vain.*

CHAP.

C H A P. I.

The DIVINITY of CHRIST.

I.

Isa. viii. 13, 14. Sanctify the LORD OF HOSTS HIMSELF, and let HIM be your fear, and let HIM be your dread: and HE shall be for a Sanctuary; but for a STONE OF STUMBLING and ROCK OF OFFENCE to both houses of *Israel*.

1 *Pet.* ii. 7, 8. The stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a STONE OF STUMBLING and a ROCK OF OFFENCE.

Instead of reasoning upon these words of the Prophet *Isaiah*, according to any private interpretation, I add another passage of Scripture, wherein they are expressly applied to the person of *Christ*; and then shew what must be the result of *both*. If the scripture, thus compared with itself, be drawn up into an argument, the conclusion may indeed be *denied*, and so may the whole Bible, but it cannot be *answered*. For example.

The *Stone of Stumbling* and *Rock of offence*, as the former text affirms, is the *Lord of Hosts himself*; a name which the *Arians* allow to no other but the one, only, true, and supreme God.^b

But, this *Stone of Stumbling* and *Rock of Offence*, as it appears from the latter text, is no other than *Christ*, the same stone which the *builders refused*; Therefore,

B 4

Christ

^b See an *Essay on Spirit*, p. 65. *Clarke's Doctr. of the Trin.* C. 1. §. 3. 402.

Christ is the LORD OF HOSTS HIMSELF : and the *Arian* is confuted upon his own principles.

II.

Isai. vi. 5. Mine Eyes have SEEN the King, the LORD OF HOSTS.

John xii. 41. These things said *Esaias*, when he SAW HIS (CHRIST'S) GLORY, and spake of HIM.

Jesus is the person here spoken of by St. *John*; whose *Glory*, *Esaias* is declared to have *seen* upon that occasion, where the prophet affirms of himself, that his eyes had *seen* the Lord of Hosts: Therefore,

Jesus is the LORD OF HOSTS.

III.

Isai. xlv. 6. Thus saith the Lord, the King of *Israe* and his Redeemer, the LORD OF HOSTS, I am THE FIRST, and I am THE LAST, and BESIDES ME there is NO GOD.

Rev. xxii. 13. I (*Jesus*) am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, THE FIRST and THE LAST.

These Titles of *the first* and *the last* are confined to him alone, *besides whom there is no God*: But *Jesus* hath assumed these Titles to *himself*: Therefore, *Jesus* is that *God*, *besides whom there is no other*. Or thus—There is no *God* besides him who is *the first* and *the last*: but *Jesus* is *the first* and *the last*; therefore *besides Jesus* there is *no other God*.

IV.

Isai. xliii. 11. I even I am the LORD, and BESIDES ME there is NO SAVIOUR.^b

2 *Pet.*

^b The argument drawn from this text will be equally convincing which ever way it be taken—*Jesus* Christ is a *Saviour*, therefore he is *Jehovah*, the *Lord*—*Jesus* Christ is *Jehovah* therefore he is *the Saviour*. The best observations I have ever met with upon the name *Jehovah*, and its application to the second

2 *Pet.* iii. 18. OUR LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.

Jesus Christ then, is our *Saviour*; or as he is called, *John* IV. 42. *The Saviour of the World*. But unless he were *God*, even the *Lord*, *Jehovah*, as well as man, he could not be a *Saviour*; because the *Lord* has declared, there is no *Saviour* beside *himself*. It is therefore rightly observed by the Apostle, *Phil.* II. 9. that *God* in dignifying the man *Christ* with the name of *JESUS*, hath given him a name above every name, even that of a *Saviour*, which is his own name, and such as can belong to no other.

V.

Rev. xxii. 6. THE LORD GOD of the *Holy Prophets* SENT HIS ANGEL to shew unto his *Servants* the things which must shortly be done.

Ibid. v. 16. I JESUS HAVE SENT MINE ANGEL to testify unto you these things in the Churches.

The Angel that appeared to St. *John* was the *Angel* of the *Lord God*, and the *Lord God* sent him: but he was the *Angel* of *Jesus*, and *Jesus* sent him: therefore, *Jesus* is the *Lord God of the Holy Prophets*.

VI.

Luke i. 76. And thou Child shalt be called the Prophet of THE HIGHEST, for thou shalt GO BEFORE the FACE of the LORD TO PREPARE HIS WAYS.

Matth.

second Person of the Trinity, are to be found in a *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity from the Exceptions of a late pamphlet, entitled, an Essay on Spirit*—by the learned Dr. T. Randolph, President of C. C. C. in Oxford; which I would desire the Reader to consult, from p. 61. to 71. of Pt. I.

Matth. xi. 10. Behold I send my messenger BEFORE THY FACE, to PREPARE THY WAY before thee.

John the Baptist goes before the *face of the Lord*, that is, of the *Highest*, whose *prophet* he is, to prepare *his* way. But, he was *sent* as a Messenger before the *face of Christ*, to prepare *his* way; who, therefore, is the *Lord*, and the *Highest*.

VII.

The two following texts are but a repetition of the same argument: but as they speak of *Christ* under a different name, they ought to have a place for themselves.

Luke i. 16, 17. And many of the Children of *Israel* shall he turn to the LORD THEIR GOD: and he shall go before HIM.

Matth. iii. 11. HE that cometh AFTER ME is mightier than I—&c.

Here again, the *Baptist* is said to go before the *Lord God of the children of Israel*: but it is certain, he went before *Jesus Christ*, the only person, who is said to come after him: therefore *Jesus Christ* is the *Lord God of the children of Israel*. And the same title is given to him in the prophet *Hosea*,—*I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the Lord their God*: which can be no other than the voice of *God the Father*, promising *Salvation* by the person of *God the Son*.

VIII.

Matth. xi. 10. Behold I send MY messenger before THY face, to prepare THY way before THEE.

Mal. iii. 1. Behold I send MY messenger to prepare the way before ME.

As this prophecy is worded by *St. Matthew* (as also by *St. Mark*^a and *St. Luke*^b) there is a personal distinction between

^a *Mark* i. 2.

^b *Luke* vii. 27.

tween Him who *sends* his *Messenger*, and *Christ* before whom the *Messenger* is sent—I send MY *Messenger*—to *prepare thy way* before THEE. But the *prophet* himself has it thus—I send MY *Messenger*, to *prepare the way* before ME. Yet the *Evangelist* and the *Prophet* are both equally correct and true. For though *Christ* be a *different person*, yet is he *one* and the *same God* with the *Father*. And hence it is, that with the *Evangelist* the *persons* are not *confounded*; with the *Prophet*, the *Godhead* is not *divided*. This argument may serve to justify an excellent observation of our Church in the *Homily* upon the *Resurrection*—“How dare we be so bold to renounce the presence of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*? for where *one* is, there is *God* all *whole* in *Majesty*, together with all his *power*, *wisdom*, and *goodness*.”

IX.

Psal. lxxviii. 56. They TEMPTED and provoked the MOST HIGH GOD.

1 *Cor.* ix. 9. Neither let us TEMPT CHRIST as some of *them* also *tempted*.

These Texts do both relate to the same rebellious acts of the *Israelites* in the *wilderness*. In the *former* of them, the person they *tempted* is called the *most high God*: in the *latter* he is called *Christ*: therefore, *Christ* is the *most High God*.

X.

John iii. 29. He that hath the Bride is THE BRIDE-GROOM *——(meaning *Christ*.)

But

* Another title of eminence, that shews *Christ* to be upon an equality with *God the Father*, is to be collected from the following Scriptures.

Psal. xxiii. 1. The LORD (Heb. *Yehowab*) is my SHEPHERD.

John x. 6. There shall be one fold, and ONE SHEPHERD.

If

But according to the Prophet,

Isai. liv. 5. Thy Maker is thine HUSBAND, the LORD OF HOSTS is his NAME.—

And the *Church* which is the *Bride of Christ*, can no more have two distinct *husbands*, than *Christ* can have two distinct *Churches*. As the *Church* is the *Bride*, the *Body*, the *Building* of God; and as there is *one* *Bride*, *one* *Body*, *one* *Building*; so is there on the other hand, *one* *God*, who is the *husband* or *bridegroom*; *one* *Christ*, who is the *Head*; *one* *God* with the *Lamb*, who is the *Light* of it. Compare also, *Jer.* iii. 1. and 31, 32. *Ezek.* xvi. *Hos.* ii. *Matth.* ix. 15.—xxv. 1, 2 *Cor.* ii. 2. *Eph.* v. 23. *Rev.* xix. 7. and xxi. 2. 9.

XI.

Here follow some single Texts, to which I add no parallels; there being no danger of mistaking their *application*.

John xx. 28. And *Thomas* answered and said, MY LORD and MY GOD.

XII.

If *Christ* be not the *Lord*, in *Unity* with the *Father*, there must of course be *two distinct beings*, to whom the Scripture has appropriated this character of a *Shepherd*; and that would make *two Shepherds*. But *Christ* has affirmed there is but *one Shepherd*, that is *himself*, THE SHEPHERD of the *Sheep*, ver. 2. whom *St. Peter* calls the *chief Shepherd*, 1 *Pet.* v. 4. So again—

Psal. c. 3. Know ye that the LORD he is GOD—we are His people, and the SHEEP of His pasture.

John x. 3. He (that is, *Christ* himself) calleth His own SHEEP.

And again—*John* xxi. 16. Feed MY *Sheep*—said *Christ* to *St. Peter*: which in the language of *St. Peter* himself 1. *Pet.* v. 2. is—Feed the Flock of GOD.

XII.

Rom. ix. 5. Of whom as concerning the Flesh CHRIST came, who is over all, GOD BLESSED for ever. *Amen.*

XIII.

2 Pet. i. 1.—Through the Righteousness of OUR GOD and Saviour JESUS CHRIST.

The Greek is — *τὸ θεὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Σωτὴρ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Χρῖστος* —the very same, as to the order and Grammar of the words, with the last verse of this Epistle — *τὸ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν καὶ Σωτῆρι Ἰησοῦ Χρῖστῳ* which is thus rendered in our English version—*of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*. And so, without doubt, it should be in the other passage: there being no possible reason why, *τὸ θεὸς ἡμῶν*, should not signify, *our God*, as well as, *τὸ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν*, *our Lord*. It is not my design to cast any reflection upon the wisdom of our excellent and orthodox *Translators* (whose version, taken all together, is, without exception, the best extant in the world) or to advance this as any discovery of my own: for the *Translators* themselves have preserved the true rendering in the *Margin*; declaring it by their customary Note, to be the *literal Sense* of the Greek.

There is another expression, *Tit. ii. 13.* that ought to be classed with the foregoing. *Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing, τὸ μεγαλὸν θεὸς καὶ Σωτὴρ ὁ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χρῖστος*, of our Great God and Saviour Jesus Christ. Of which a great man, deep in the *Arian Scheme*, gives this desponding account—“Many understand this whole sentence to belong to one and the same person, viz. Christ; as if the words should have been rendered, *The appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ*. Which Construction, the words will indeed bear; as do also those in 2 Pet. i. 1. But it is much more reasonable, and more agreeable to the *whole tenor of Scripture*, to understand the former part of the words, to relate to the
“*Father*”

¹ Clarke's Doctr. of the Trin. C. § 1. 541.

"*Father.*" As for the *whole tenor of Scripture*, it is a weighty phrase, but very easily made use of in any cause good or bad: so I shall leave the reader to judge of *that*, after it has been exhibited to him in the following pages. And as for the *reasonableness* of the thing itself, let any serious person consider, whether the Doctrine of the Scripture is not more *rational* under the orthodox application of these words, than under that of this Author. For to allow, as he does, that *Christ* is *God*, but not the *Great God*, is to make *two Gods*, a *greater* and a *lesser*; which is no very *rational* principle. And I make not the least doubt but this Author, had he been dressing up a System of *natural religion*, would have protested against a notion so absurd and impious. But when the *Scripture* was to be *dealt* with, he chose it as the lesser of two evils, the greater of which, was the Doctrine he had *subscribed* to.

XIV.

2 Cor. v. 19. GOD WAS IN CHRIST, reconciling the world to HIMSELF.

It is allowed on all hands, that the *world* was *reconciled* by Christ Jesus to the *one, only, great* and *supreme God*. But, this very *same God* (for the word is but *once* used in the whole sentence) was *in Christ*; manifest *in the flesh*, and *reconciling the world* to himself. And were there no other passage of Scripture to be found, this alone is sufficient to overthrow the whole Doctrine of *Arianism*; which, as far as the Scripture is concerned, depends upon this one assertion—that "the word GOD, in Scripture, NEVER signifies a complex notion of *more persons than one*; but ALWAYS means *one person only*, viz. either "the person of the *Father* singly, or the person of the *Son* singly." ¹ Which is absolutely false: for here it signifies *both*. The text considers *God* as agent and patient at the same time, and upon the same occasion; as the *reconciler* of the world, in the *person* of the *Son*; and the ob-

¹ Clarke's S. D. P. II. §. 33.

ject to whom the *reconciliation was made*, in the *Person* of the *Father*; yet there is but one word (*God*) to express them *both*. So that the word *God*, though of the *singular* number, is of a *plural* comprehension. And thus I find it to have been taken by some of the most eminent writers before the council of *Nice*, "*Psalmatus in initio homo per manus DEI, id est, FILII & SPIRITUS*," says *Irenæus*; ¹ putting the singular name of *God*, for the *two persons* of the *Son* and *Spirit*. And the same word, in the language of *Origen*, (if we are allowed to take the version of *Ruffinus* as genuine) includes the whole *three persons*—*Igitur de DEO, id est, de PATRE & FILIO & SPIRITU sancto*. ² And our excellent Church has used the word *God* in the same sense; as in the *Blessing* after the communion service—*GOD ALMIGHTY, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*.

XV.

John xiv. 11. I am in the Father, and the Father
IN ME.

Compare this with the foregoing Article.

XVI.

² *Cor.* v. 20. We are ambassadors for CHRIST, as though GOD did BESEECH you by us. We PRAY you IN CHRIST'S STEAD be ye reconciled to GOD.

The usefulness of this text to our present subject, lies in these words—"In *Christ's* stead we *pray*, as though *God* did *beseech*"—where the interchanging of the Names *God* and *Christ*, shews the *same* person to be entitled to *both*.

XVII.

¹ *John* v. 20. We are in him that is true, even
in

¹ Lib. V. § 23.

² *De principiis*, Lib. IV. C. 2.

in his Son JESUS CHRIST: THIS is the TRUE GOD and eternal life.

XVIII.

Col. ii. 8. 9. Beware lest any man spoil you through Philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after CHRIST; for in HIM DWELLETH ALL THE FULNESS of the GODHEAD BODILY.

The *Apostle* foresaw, that a thing, calling itself *Philosophy*, would set all its engines at work to destroy the notion of *Christ's* true and absolute Divinity—"For in him" (says he) *dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.* "*Philosophy* will dispute this; and undertake to demonstrate the contrary. But if you listen to such vain deceit, it will overthrow your faith, and spoil you for a disciple of *Jesus Christ*: therefore—*Beware.*"

XIX.

John i. 1. The WORD WAS GOD.

XX.

Isai. ix. 6. For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the Government shall be upon his Shoulder: and his name shall be called wonderful, Counsellor, the MIGHTY GOD, the EVER-LASTING FATHER.

XXI.

Jer. xxiii. 6. This is the Name whereby he shall be called, the Lord (JEHOVAH) our Righteousness.

XXII.

Isai. ii. 17, 18. The LORD ALONE shall be EX-
ALTED

ALTERED in that *day*: and the IDOLS he shall utterly abolish.

“ *Idolatry* is the reverse, and direct opposite to *Christianity* (or, the *day of Christ*.) To destroy this, was the great end of *Christ*’s coming into the world.— But except he were *God*, the *very* and *eternal God* of *one Substance* with the *Father*, his Religion would be so far from *destroying Idolatry*, that it would only be a more refined and dangerous species of it. The Prophet therefore, concludes all, that so he might acquit the worship of *Christ* from all charge of *Idolatry*, with this positive assertion; that it would prove the most effectual means of putting an end to all false and idolatrous Worship: *The idols he shall utterly abolish*. The like conclusion we meet with in the Apostle *St. John*; who having affirmed that *Jesus Christ* is the *true God*, and *eternal life*, immediately subjoins and closes all with this advice—*Little Children, keep yourselves from IDOLS.*”

This Remark is taken from the first Volume of an *Essay upon the proper Lessons*; written, as I am told, by a Gentleman of the Laity. There needs no Apology for setting it down; it being of good use in the subject I am upon. And it also gives me an occasion of returning thanks to the pious and learned Author of that excellent work, not for myself only, but for many sincere friends to the religion of *Christ* and the Church of *England*, among whom his labours are not without their fruit; and I am confident they will not be without their reward: but the Author must be content to wait for it, till *Wisdom shall be justified of all her Children*.

XXIII.

Rev. i. 8. I am *Alpha* and *Omega*, the beginning and the ending, saith the LORD, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the ALMIGHTY.

C

IF

If the Reader will be pleased to examine the 13th and 17th verses of this Chapter, it will appear that this 8th verse was undoubtedly spoken from the mouth of *Christ*: who therefore has a just title to every name and attribute expressed in it; and among the rest, to that of *the Almighty*.

Origen, who certainly was no *Arian*, though often represented as such, by some, who would be pleased to have the vote of so celebrated a genius, has the following observation—"Now that you may know the *Omnipotence* of the *Father* and the *Son* to be *one* and the *same* as HE is ONE and the SAME GOD and LORD with the FATHER, hear what *St. John* has said in the *Revelation*—These things saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty. For who is the Almighty that is to come, but *Christ*?"

XXIV.

The texts that follow, with this mark (†) prefixed to them, are such as have been abused by the *Arians* to support their Heresy: and to the best of my knowledge, there are some of every sort. But when the Scripture is brought to declare its own sense of them, they will either appear to be nothing to the purpose, or confirm and preach the faith they have been supposed to destroy.

† *Matt. xix. 17.* Why callest thou ME GOOD? there is none good but ONE, that is GOD.

The objection is founded upon the *Greek*, which runs—Οὐδὲς ἑστὶν ἀγαθός, οὐ μὴ ἓς, ὁ Θεός. There is none good, but, ἓς, one; and that (one) is, ὁ Θεός, God. Whence it

† Ut autem unam & eandem omnipotentiam Patris & Filii esse cognoscas, sicut unus atque idem est cum Patre Deus & Dominus, audi hoc modo *Joan.* in *Apocalypsi* dicentem: Hac dicit Dominus Deus qui est, & qui erit, & qui venturus est omnipotens. Qui enim venturus est omnipotens, quis est alius nisi *Christus*?—De principiis, Lib. I. C. 2.

it is argued, that the adjective *ὁ* being in the *masculine* Gender, cannot be interpreted to signify one *Being* or *Nature* (for then it should have been *ἐν*, in the *Neuter*); but *one Person*: so that by confining the attribute of *goodness* to the single person of *the Father*, it must of course exclude the persons of the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* from the *Unity* of the *Godhead*.

To say the truth, I think this is the most plausible objection I have ever met with; and I have sincerely endeavoured to do it justice. If it is capable of being set in a stronger light, any man is welcome to add what he pleases to it. For supposing the word *ὁ* to signify *one person*, (and in that lies the whole force of the argument,) then if *one person* only is *good*, and that person is *God*; it must also follow that there is but one person who is *God*: the name of *God* being as much confined thereby to a *single person*, as the attribute of *goodness*. But this is utterly false; the names of *God*, *Lord*, *Lord of Hosts*, *the Almighty*, *most High*, *Eternal*, *God of Israel*, &c. being also ascribed to the *second* and *third Persons* of the blessed *Trinity*. Take it this way therefore, and the objection by proving too much, confutes itself, and proves nothing.

The truth is, this criticism, upon the strength of which some have dared to undeify their Saviour, has no foundation in the Original. The word *ὁ* is so far from requiring the substantive *person* to be understood with it, that it is put in the *masculine* gender to agree with its substantive *θεος*, and is best construed by an adverb. If you follow the Greek by a literal translation, it will be thus—*There is none Good—ὁ μὴ ὁ θεός—*but the one *God*; that is, in common English—*but God only*. And it happens, that the same Greek, word for word, occurs in *Mark* ii. 7.—*Who can forgive sins—ὁ μὴ ὁ θεός—*but *God only*: so it is rendered by our Translators: and we have a plain matter of fact, that *ὁ* in this place cannot possibly admit the sense of *one person*, because *Christ*, who is *another person*, took upon him to *forgive sins*. In

the parallel place of St. *Luke's* Gospel, ¹ the expression is varied, so as to make it still clearer—“*μη μόνος ο Θεός*—not *εις*, but *μόνος*, another adjective of the *masculine* gender; which though it agree with its substantive *Θεός*, is rightly construed as an *adverb*—either the *alone* God, or, *God only*. And the Greek itself uses one for the other indifferently—as, *ἐν ἁρτῷ μόνῳ*, *by Bread only* ²—*ἐν λόγῳ μόνον*, *in word only*. ³ The utmost that can be gathered, therefore, from these words, is no more than this; that there is *one* God (in which we are all agreed,) and that there is *none* good beside him; which nobody will dispute. Whether in this *God*, there be *one* person, or *three*, remains yet to be considered: and the Scripture is so express in other places, as to settle it beyond all dispute.

If it should here be asked, for what reason *Christ* put this Question—“Why callest thou me *good*?” I answer; for the same reason that he asked the *Pharisees*, why *David* in Spirit called him LORD: ⁴ and that was, to try if they were able to account for it. This ruler, by addressing our Saviour under the name of *good Master*, when the inspired Psalmist had affirmed long before, that *there is none that doeth* GOOD, no NOT ONE; ⁵ did in effect allow him to be *God*: no mere man, since the fall of *Adam*, having any claim to that character. And when he was called upon to explain his meaning, for that *God* only was *good*; he should have replied in the words of St. *Thomas*—“My Lord and my GOD:” which would have been a noble Instance of Faith, and have cleared up the whole difficulty. If the case be considered, this man was a very proper subject for such a trial. Fully convinced of his own sufficiency, he comes to Christ, in the presence of his disciples, to know what good thing he might do to merit everlasting life. Whence our Saviour takes occasion to correct his mistake as to the nature of *goodness*; and having tried this *good* and *perfect*

¹ *Luke* v. 21.

² *Matt.* iv. 4.

³ *1 Theff.* i. 5.

⁴ *Matt.* xxii. 43.

⁵ *Psalms* xiv. 3.

perfect man in a tender point, sent him away grievously dissatisfied.

XXV.

† 1 Cor. xv. 24. Then cometh the END, when HE shall deliver up the KINGDOM to GOD, even the FATHER.

Luke i. 33. HE (*Jesus*) shall reign over the house of *Jacob* for ever; and of HIS KINGDOM there shall be NO END.

This of St. *Luke*, being a contradiction in terms to that of the *Apostle*, shews the former to be spoken *only* of *Christ's* humanity; as the latter relates *only* to his *Divinity*. When both are laid together, it is evident to a demonstration, that *Christ* is *perfect God*, as well as *perfect man*. As *man*, he *received* a *kingdom*, which again, as *man*, he shall *deliver up*, when his mediatorial office, for which he took the nature of man, shall be at an *end*. But there is a *kingdom* pertaining to him, which shall have *no end*. And this cannot be true, unless he is a *person* in that *God*, who after the *Humanity* has *delivered up* the *kingdom*, shall be *all in all*. The distinction in this case between the *God* and *man* in the *joint-person* of *Christ-Jesus*, is warranted by another part of the Chapter, wherein the *Apostle* has given us a key to his own meaning. Since by MAN (*says he*) *came death*, by MAN *came also the resurrection of the dead*. For as in *Adam* all die, even so in *Christ* shall all be made alive. Here, it is evident, he is drawing a contrast between the *man Adam*, and the *man Christ*; so that unless it be done on purpose, no reader can easily mistake the meaning of what follows—Then cometh the End, when HE (that is the *man Christ*, the second *Adam*) shall deliver up the *Kingdom*, &c. for so it must be, according to the tenor of the *Apostle's* discourse.

The *New Testament* abounds with expressions of this nature; but they have no difficulty in them, if it only be remembered that *Christ* is *man* as well as *God*; which the *Arians* are willing upon all occasions to forget. And

it has been chiefly owing to an abuse of these texts, that they have been able to put any tolerable gloss upon their Heresy. The *Old Testament* seldom speaking of *Christ*, but as a Person of the Godhead *before* his Incarnation, does not afford them so many opportunities; and hence it is, that most of them confine their enquiries to the *New*, which is the history of him *after* his Incarnation, when he appeared, as the *first born of many brethren*, ¹ *anointed above his Fellows (Mankind)* receiving authority and dominion from *God*, who, by a power superior to that of his human soul and body, put *all things in subjection under the feet of it*.

But some, for whose sakes he thus humbled himself, and became obedient in the flesh, instead of receiving it with humility and devotion, even cast it in his teeth, and make it an argument *against* him: vainly imagining that they do honour to their supreme God, while they say with *Peter*—Lord, *be it far from thee: this shall not*, it cannot, *be unto thee*. And it is worth their while to consider, whether they may not fall under the same rebuke, when it will be too late to retract and change their opinion.

A solemn Advocate of theirs, whom I take to be a *dis-senter*, tells us—his *present concern is with the New Testament* only. ² And another writer of some figure, who, you are to suppose, is addressing himself to a *young Clergyman*, puts it into his head, that he “*may reject Arguments brought from the Old Testament to prove the Trinity, as trifling, and proving nothing but the Ignorance of those that make use of them.*”^{*} And I could wish that were all: for I had much rather be accounted a *fool* in their judgment, than find myself under a necessity of charging them with the horrible guilt of *denying the Lord that hath bought them*.

XXVI.

¹ *Rom. viii. 29.*

² *A Sequel to the Essay on Spirit, p. 8.*

^{*} *Letter to a young Clergyman upon the Difficulties and Discouragements which attend the Study of the Scriptures in the way of private judgement.*

XXVI.

† *Acts* x. 42.—That it is **HE**, which is **ORDAINED** of **GOD** to be the *judge* of quick and dead.

This Passage will help us to detect, once for all, that common fallacy of our Adversaries, in misapplying such words as relate only to the *human* nature of *Christ*, and erecting arguments thereupon to the degrading of his supreme Essence. *Christ* is *ordained* of *God*; it is true: and the nature that *receives* power must be *inferior* to the nature that *confers* it. But is his *Godhead* therefore *ordained*? They tell you it is; and their scheme requires it: But the *Scripture* declares the contrary—**GOD** (saith *St. Paul*) *hath appointed a day wherein HE will JUDGE the world in righteousness by that MAN* (¹ *and*, *IN that MAN*) *whom he hath ORDAINED.* The supreme God that was manifest in the *flesh*, and *IN Christ* reconciling the world to **HIMSELF**, shall remain in the same personal union with him, till he has *judged* the world, and is ready to *deliver up the kingdom*. And though our *Judge* shall even then retain the Character of a *Man*, yet as *God*, who *ordained* him, shall be present with him in the same person, the act of the last judgment is equally ascribed to both natures. In the text just above cited, it is said—*He* (*God*) *will judge the world*; tho' it immediately follows, that a *man*, even the *man Christ*, is *ordained* to this office. And so we have it again in the *Epistle to the Romans*—*we shall all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ. For it is written, as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to ME, and every tongue shall confess unto GOD.* ² We are to give an account of ourselves at the *judgment-seat* of *Christ*. And how does the *Apostle* prove it? Why, because it is written, that we shall give an account of ourselves to the *Lord God*, who swears that *he liveth*. But unless *Christ*, who is a *man*, be also this *living God* and *Lord*, his proof is not to the purpose.

C 4

XXVII.

¹ *Acts* xvii. 31.

² *Rom.* XIV. 10, 11.

XXVII.

† *Acts* x. 40. Him GOD raised up and SHEWED HIM openly to us, who did eat and drink with him *after he rose from the dead.*

John xxi. 1. After these things JESUS SHEWED HIMSELF again to his *disciples* at the Sea of *Tiberias*; and on this wise SHEWED HE HIMSELF.

The former text takes something from *Christ*, as *man*; in which capacity he was at the *disposal of the Father*. But the latter restores it to him again as *God*; under which character he is at his *own disposal*, and in unity with the Father. The same is to be said of the two articles that follow.

XXVIII.

† *John* iii. 16. GOD so LOVED the world, that HE GAVE his only begotten Son.

Ephes. v. 25. CHRIST also LOVED the Church, and GAVE HIMSELF for it.

XXIX.

† *Eph.* iv. 32. *Forgiving one another*, even as GOD, for CHRIST'S SAKE, hath FORGIVEN *you*.

Col. iii. 13. *Forgiving one another*—even as CHRIST FORGAVE *you*.

XXX.

† *John* vi. 38. I came down from heaven, NOT to do MY OWN WILL, but the WILL of HIM that sent ME.

Matth. viii. 2. And behold there came a Leper and *worshipped* him, saying, LORD, if THOU WILT thou canst make me clean. And JESUS said, (*Θεω*) I WILL, be thou clean.

† *Acts* iv. 29, 30. And now, LORD—grant—that *signs and wonders* may be *done* by the NAME of THY HOLY CHILD JESUS.

It

It seems here, that *signs* and *wonders* were not to be wrought by *Jesus Christ*, as the *author* of them; but by an higher power of the LORD, put into action by the *name*, *Merits*, or *Intercession* of the *Holy Child Jesus*. Yet *St. Peter* makes this same *Jesus*, though in *heaven*, the immediate author of the *signs* and *wonders* wrought by his disciples upon earth.—“*Eneas* (says he) **JESUS CHRIST maketh thee whole.**” *Acts* ix. 34.

XXXII.

† *Matth.* xx. 23. To sit on my right hand and on my left, is NOT MINE TO GIVE, but (*it shall be given*) to them for whom it is prepared of MY FATHER.

Yet our blessed Saviour has promised elsewhere, to bestow this reward in his *own right*—“*To him that overcometh will I GRANT TO SIT WITH ME IN MY THRONE.*” *Rev.* iii. 21. This is sufficient to rescue the text from any heretical use that may have been made of it. But still there remains some difficulty, which, with God’s help, I shall endeavour to clear up. It will appear to any person, not ignorant of *Greek*, that the original in this place does reserve to *Christ* that act of power and authority, of which the *English* version, by inserting a few words, seems to have divested him. The *Greek* is this—*οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐμὸν δίδου*—*it is not mine to give*, *ἀλλ’ οἷς προτιμασθαι*, *but to them for whom it is prepared*—“*nisi quibus paratum est.*” For in the 11th verse of the foregoing Chapter, there is an expression exactly parallel—*ἀλλ’ οἷς δίδεται*—*save they to whom it is given*; or as *Beza* hath it—“*sed ii quibus datum.*” Now there can be no grammatical reason, why we should not take—*ἀλλ’ οἷς προτιμασθαι*—in the same manner; and then the text will affirm what it now seems to deny. For to say, that *Christ* cannot give any particular reward, *save to them for whom it is prepared of his Father*, is the same as to say, that to *such* he can and will give it: according to the common maxim—*Exceptio probat regulam in non exceptis.*

The Scope of the Text therefore, is to shew, that
nothing

nothing can be granted even by Almighty power itself, where there is not a suitable merit or disposition in the persons who claim it. "God shall give this honourable place to those, for whom it is prepared by an invariable rule of justice: whose *victory* of Faith being foreknown and accepted, a seat is allotted them according to it." And the two passages being laid together, supply us with this principle. As if our Saviour, who is the *speaker* in both places, had said—"Tho' it be *not mine to give*; yet, to him that *overcometh*, will I (even I myself) grant to sit with me in my *Throne*; because for him this seat is prepared." It is not owing to a defect of power in the Trinity, or in any person of it, that the divine purpose cannot be changed; but because it is impossible for the power of God, to break in upon the order of his distributive justice. And it is upon this account only, that we read of *Christ*, Mark vi. 5. "He **COULD** there do No mighty work." For the power of doing a miracle was always present with him; but the place being *improper* because of their *unbelief*, made the thing impossible. In the same manner, that declaration of the Lord in Gen. xvii. 22, is to be accounted for—*Haste thee, escape thither, for I CANNOT do any thing, till thou be come thither*. No man would hence conclude, that the hand of God is straitened, or his power limited; but only that he does, and by his own nature *must*, act agreeable to the disposition of things and persons, known to himself.

XXXIII.

† 1 Cor. viii. 6. To us there is but ONE GOD,
THE FATHER.

If we compare with this, that expression of St. Thomas, —John xx. 28.—MY LORD, and MY GOD, we have the following argument;

To us there is but ONE GOD the FATHER.

But, TO US JESUS CHRIST IS GOD: therefore, The Gospel has either preached *two Gods to us*, one distinct from the other: or, that *one God the Father* is here the name

name of a *nature*, under which *Christ* himself, as *God*, is also comprehended. And the same may be proved of it in several other places.

XXXIV.

† *Matth.* xxiii. 9. Call no man your Father upon earth, for ONE IS YOUR FATHER *which is in heaven.*

Ibid. v. 10. Neither be ye called masters, for ONE IS YOUR MASTER, EVEN CHRIST. *John* iii. 13. *which is in heaven.*

Dr. *Clarke* has a particular section, * wherein he pretends to have set down *the Passages that ascribe the highest Titles, Perfections and Powers*, to the second Person of the Trinity. Yet he has wholly omitted the latter of these verses; though by a rule of his own making, it allows to *Christ* an higher title than any other in the whole Scripture. It is this same author, who has laid so great a stress upon the word *us*, *one*, which he has insisted upon it can signify nothing else, but *one Person*; and the criticism is thought to be of such use and importance to his Scheme, that his book *begins* with it; and in the course of his work it is repeated three times, nearly in the same words. But the Passage now before us, if he had produced it, would have turned his own weapon against himself. For the word *us*, is here an attribute of *Christ*; and if we argue from it in this place, as he has done in the other, it must prove, that *one person* only is our *Master*, and that this person is *Christ*: which excludes the Persons of the *Father* and the *Spirit* from the honour of that title; and so reduces that learned author's reasoning to a manifest absurdity.

We are to conclude then, that as the Phrase, *one Master*, cannot be meant to exclude the *Father*; so neither does that other—*one is good* (supposing that were the sense of

* Chap. ii. §. 3.

of the Greek) or *one is your Father*, exclude the person of *Christ*. And if the reason of the thing teaches us that it cannot, so the *Scripture* assures us in fact that it does not: the title of *Father*, being also ascribed to the second person of the Trinity. For *Christ*, the *Alpha* and *Omega*, says of himself—*He that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be HIS GOD, and he shall be MY SON.* ¹ *Isaiah* calls him—*The Everlasting Father.* ² And again it is written—*They are the CHILDREN of GOD, being the children of the RESURRECTION:* ³ But, says *Christ*,—*I am the RESURRECTION:* ⁴ therefore he is *God*, and hath us for *his Children*. If this be the case, the word *Father* cannot always be a name that distinguishes *God* from another person of *God*; but is often to be understood as a term of relation between *God* and *Man*: or, as a modern Divine of our Church has well expressed it—“A word not intended for *God the Father* only, the “*First person* of the Trinity; but as it is referred unto “the *Creature*, made and conserved by *God*; in which “sense it appertains to the *whole Trinity*.”

XXXV.

† *John* xiv. 28. MY FATHER IS GREATER than I.

The two preceding Articles will sufficiently justify what the Church has asserted with a view to this passage—That *Christ* is “*inferior to the Father as touching his “Manhood.*” And the stream of the whole *Scripture* is against that use the *Arians* generally make of it; who stand in need to be reminded at every turn, that in the person of *Christ*, there is an *human* soul and body; the nature of a *man*; which, as it cannot lay claim to what is spoken of *Christ* in unity with the *Father*, so it must receive to its own account whatever seems to degrade and disjoin him from the *Father*. It is indeed hard to say which of the two heresies is the most unreasonable and unscriptural;

¹ *Rev.* xxi. 7. ² *ix.* 6. ³ *Luke* xx. 36. ⁴ *John* xi. 25.

unscriptural; that of the *Socinians*, which never considers *Christ* as any thing but a *mere man*, or that of the *Arians*, who never look upon him as any thing but a *supposititious God*. Between those two gross errors, lies the true Catholic Faith; which as it allows him to be *perfect God* and *perfect man*, is never offended, or put to its shifts, by any thing the Scripture may have said about him in either capacity.

XXXVI.

† 1 Cor. xi. 3. The HEAD of *Christ* is GOD.

The name *Christ* does here stand, as in other places out of number, for the *man Christ*; otherwise it must follow, that as *Christ* is *God*, *God* is the head of *himself*; which is a contradiction: or that *one God* is the head of *another God*; which also is a contradiction.

This Text is capable of a good illustration from *Gen. iii. 15.* where we read, that the *heel* of the promised seed should be *bruised*: by which, the church has always understood the sufferings of his *human nature*, metaphorically represented by the *inferior* part in man. So in this place, his *Divinity*, or *superior nature*, is as aptly signified by the *head* or *superior* part of the human body.

XXXVII.

† *Mark xiii. 32.* But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in heaven, neither THE SON, but THE FATHER.

It is declared of *Christ* in another place, that he *increased in wisdom*:^d why should it be incredible then, that during the whole term of his humiliation in the flesh, something should still be left, which as man upon earth he did not know? If you suppose him to be ignorant
of

^d *Luke ii. 52.*

of the *Greek*) or *one is your Father*, exclude the person of *Christ*. And if the reason of the thing teaches us, that it cannot, so the *Scripture* assures us in fact that it does not: the title of *Father*, being also ascribed to the second person of the Trinity. For *Christ*, the *Alpha* and *Omega*, says of himself—*He that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be HIS GOD, and he shall be MY SON.* ¹ *Isaiah* calls him—*The Everlasting Father.* ² And again it is written—*They are the CHILDREN of GOD, being the children of the RESURRECTION:* ³ But, says *Christ*,—*I am the RESURRECTION:* ⁴ therefore he is *God*, and hath us for his Children. If this be the case, the word *Father* cannot always be a name that distinguishes *God* from another person of *God*; but is often to be understood as a term of relation between *God* and *Man*: or, as a modern Divine of our Church has well expressed it—“A word not intended for *God the Father* only, the “*First person* of the Trinity; but as it is referred unto “the *Creature*, made and conserved by *God*; in which “sense it appertains to the whole Trinity.”

XXXV.

† *John* xiv. 28. MY FATHER IS GREATER than I.

The two preceding Articles will sufficiently justify what the Church has asserted with a view to this passage—That *Christ* is “*inferior to the Father as touching his “Manhood.*” And the stream of the whole *Scripture* is against that use the *Arians* generally make of it; who stand in need to be reminded at every turn, that in the person of *Christ*, there is an *human* soul and body, the nature of a *man*; which, as it cannot lay claim to what is spoken of *Christ* in unity with the *Father*, so it must receive to its own account whatever seems to degrade and disjoin him from the *Father*. It is indeed hard to say which of the two heresies is the most unreasonable and unscriptural;

¹ *Rev.* xxi. 7. ² *ix.* 6. ³ *Luke* xx. 36. ⁴ *John* xi. 25.

unscriptural; that of the *Socinians*, which never considers *Christ* as any thing but a *mere man*, or that of the *Arians*, who never look upon him as any thing but a *supposititious God*. Between those two gross errors, lies the true Catholic Faith; which as it allows him to be *perfect God* and *perfect man*, is never offended, or put to its shifts, by any thing the Scripture may have said about him in either capacity.

XXXVI.

† 1 Cor. xi. 3. The HEAD of *Christ* is GOD.

The name *Christ* does here stand, as in other places out of number, for the *man Christ*; otherwise it must follow, that as *Christ* is *God*, *God* is the head of *himself*; which is a contradiction: or that *one God* is the head of *another God*; which also is a contradiction.

This Text is capable of a good illustration from *Gen. iii. 15.* where we read, that the *heel* of the promised seed should be *bruised*: by which, the church has always understood the sufferings of his *human nature*, metaphorically represented by the *inferior* part in man. So in this place, his *Divinity*, or *superior nature*, is as aptly signified by the *head* or *superior* part of the human body.

XXXVII.

† *Mark xiii. 32.* But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in heaven, neither THE SON, but THE FATHER.

It is declared of *Christ* in another place, that he *increased in wisdom*: ^d why should it be incredible then, that during the whole term of his humiliation in the flesh, something should still be left, which as man upon earth he did not know? If you suppose him to be ignorant
of

^d *Luke ii. 52.*

of this matter as God, how is it that St. *Peter* confesses him to be omniscient, without receiving any rebuke for it, or being reminded of any particular exception?—**LORD, thou knowest ALL THINGS.** ¹

XXXVIII.

† *John* i. 18. No man hath SEEN GOD at any time.

Ibid. xiv. 8, 9. *Philip* saith unto him, Lord, SHEW us the FATHER—hast thou not SEEN ME, *Philip*? he that hath seen ME hath seen THE FATHER.

“ These words (says Dr. *Clarke*) do not signify, that
 “ he who hath seen the *Person of Christ* hath seen the
 “ person of the Father.” No surely: but that he who
 hath seen all that was visible of Christ, hath seen the
 person, to whom was joined that invisible and divine
Nature, which the Scripture has called by the Name of
the Father. And to shew that *Christ* (though he was
 God manifest in the flesh ²) is yet no other than that same
 invisible God, whom no man hath or can see and live, we
 are told, that “ when he shall appear (glorified, not with
 “ any secondary divinity, but with the FATHER’S
 “ OWNSELF, ³) we shall be like him (fashioned like un-
 “ to his own glorious body. ⁴ and conformed to his Image ⁵)
 “ for we shall SEE him AS HE IS; which no man ever
 “ yet hath done.”

† *1 Cor.* xv. 27. But when he saith all things are
 put under him, it is manifest that HE IS EX-
 CEPTED (εκτος τε υποταξαιτος) which did put all
 things under him. And when all things shall be
 SUBDUEED (υποταγη) UNTO HIM.—

Phil.

¹ *John* xxi. 17.

² *1 Tim.* iii. 16.

³ *John* xvii. 5.

⁴ *Phil.* iii. 21.

⁵ *Rom.* viii. 29.

Phil. iii. 20, 21. We look for ~~THE SAVIOUR, the~~
~~Lord JESUS CHRIST—who—~~is ABLE EVEN
 TO SUBDUER ALL THINGS (*υποταξει τα παντα*) TO
 HIMSELF.

It is manifest, therefore, that the *exception* in the former text, is not meant to set *one Person of God*, above *another person of God*; but only to distinguish the Power of the *Divine nature* from that of the *human* in its greatest *exaltation*. As *Christ* is *man*, *all things* are *subdued* unto him by *ANOTHER*: as *Christ* is *God*, he himself is that *other*, and *able to subdue all things* to HIMSELF. And this will be sufficient to confirm the Reader in what I have already observed, that the cause of *Arianism* borrows its chief support from the *humiliation* of *Christ in the flesh*. Search the very best of their arguments to the bottom, by a diligent *comparing* of the Scripture *with itself*, and they all amount to this great absurdity—*Man is inferior to God*; therefore *God is inferior to himself*: and this they prove, by *imputing* to *Christ's Divinity* what is said *only* of his *humanity*.

I have now presented to the Reader's consideration the most noted Texts, which, under the management of *Arian* or *Spemian* Expositors, may seem to have favoured their Doctrine. Many, I hope, will be of opinion, that the Catholic cause is rather beholden to them, particularly in this last instance, for the opposition they have made against it; inasmuch as the objections they have drawn from the holy Scripture have directed us to some very clear proofs, which might otherwise have escaped our notice. If there be any other Texts more for their purpose than what I have here set down, they have my free consent to produce and enlarge upon them as much as they please. In the mean time I shall proceed to give the Reader some farther satisfaction, and endeavour to convince him, with the Blessing of God, that while *Herefy* is obliged to glean up a few scattered Passages, hard to be understood, and for that reason, easy to be
 wrested

wrested by men of perverse Inclinations; the Faith of the Church has the suffrage of the whole Bible, speaking in such words, as need not to be refined upon by any metaphysical Expositions, but only applied and considered.

XL.

Jude 4. Denying the ONLY LORD GOD, and OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST — τοῦ μονοῦ δεσποτῆς Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

As there is no Article before *Κυρίον*, the first and second comma are both meant of the same person; and the plain sense, when freed from the ambiguity of the English version, is this—*Denying the only Lord God and our Lord, Jesus Christ.*

If this should be denied (and the text tells us there are some who will *deny* any thing) it is capable of Demonstration. The words include this Proposition—there is, *ο μονος ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ*, *one only supreme Governor*: ¹ Now if this term be applied to *Christ*, it must follow that HE is that *one supreme Governor*, in the Unity of *the Father*. But it is applied to him in the parallel place of *2 Pet. ii.*

1. *Denying (ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΝ) the Lord that hath bought them*—τοῦ ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς. And if it should be doubted, whether this latter text be meant of *Christ*, it is demonstrated by another—*THOU wast slain, and hast BOUGHT us (ἡγορασας) unto God by thy Blood.* ² If this chain of reasoning be inverted, the force of it will be clear and undeniable. 1. *Christ hath bought us.* 2. He that hath bought us, is *ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ the Lord or supreme Governor.* But 3dly, there is *ο μονος ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ, one only supreme Governor.* Therefore, *Christ is he.*

XLI.

Jude 24, 25. Unto HIM that is able—to PRESENT you faultless before the PRESENCE of HIS GLORY—to the ONLY WISE GOD OUR SAVIOUR.

Eph.

¹ So Dr. Clarke has construed it. C. 1. § 3. 411.

² Rev. v. 9.

Eph. v. 27. That HE (*Christ*) might PRESENT it TO HIMSELF a glorious Church, &c.

It is the *only wise God*, who is able to present us before the presence of his Glory: But *Christ* is to present us, as members of the Church in glory, to himself: therefore, he is the *only wise God*, to whom also appertains the presence of Glory;—for that is no other than his own presence, himself.

This is another express Instance; that *μονος Θεος*, the only God, is not God in one person, but the Unity of the Trinity. For if you confine this phrase, with the *Arians*, to the single person of the Father, then of course you exclude the person of *Christ*; and then, it is manifest, you contradict the Scripture. For though it be affirmed in this place, that the *only wise God* is to present us before his own presence, yet the same is elsewhere expressed by *Christ* presenting us to himself. Which is no way to be accounted for, unless you believe *Christ* to be a partaker in the Being, attributes, and offices of the one, undivided, *only wise God*, our Saviour. Then there is no farther difficulty.

XLII.

Eph. iii. 2, 3.—The Dispensation of the Grace of GOD, which is given me to you-ward: How that BY REVELATION HE (*God*) made known unto me the mystery.

Gal. i. 12. I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but BY THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST.

XLIII.

1 *King. viii. 39.* THOU, even THOU ONLY KNOWEST the HEARTS of all the children of men.

This, it seems, is the privilege of God ONLY, but this God is *Christ*; for says he.

D

Rev.

Rev. ii. 23. All the Churches shall know that I am
HE which *searcheth* the reins and HEARTS.

Indeed this latter verse speaks plain enough for itself, without being compared with the former. It implies, that there is *one only* who *searcheth* the *hearts* of men, and that *Christ* is *he*. And the Greek will very well bear it; as the learned reader will easily perceive. It is thus—
ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἐρευνῶν—I here is ὁ ἐρευνῶν, *one that searcheth*; but
—ἐγώ εἰμι—I am *He*.

XLIV.

2 *Pet. i. 4.*—*Exceeding great and precious promises*, that by these you might be (θεῶν κοινωνοὶ φύσεως) PARTAKERS of the DIVINE NATURE.

Heb. iii. 14. For we are made (μετοχοὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) PARTAKERS of CHRIST, if we hold the beginning of our confidence in the *precious promises* of God) stedfast unto the end.

What St. *Peter* proposes, as the end of our hope in the *promises*, is to be *partakers of the divine Nature*: but this, according to St. *Paul*, is to be *partakers of Christ*: therefore Christ is *in* or *of* the *Divine Nature*; the same *Almighty God* ¹ and *Lord*, who declared to *Abraham*—*I am thy Shield, and thy EXCEEDING GREAT REWARD* ². So that these texts being compared together, are decisive for the Catholic *Homoousian* Doctrine, at which the *Arians*, from the Council of *Nice* to this very day, have been so grievously offended. And it has not been without reason. For if the word *Consubstantial* be applicable to the Person of *Christ*; it makes short work with their *Heresy*. To this end, it was fixed upon and agreed to by the Bishops of the whole Christian World; * as the most proper Bar and
Badge

¹ *Gen. xvii. 1.*

² *xv. 1.*

* I say, of the *whole Christian World*: though a late Author calls this *Oecumenical Council*, summoned for the
con-

Badge of distinction between the *Arians* and themselves. But they object, that the term is *not scriptural*; nay, there are some, of no ordinary figure amongst them, who have not stuck to call it an invention of *Popery*¹; though it is well known, that at the time this word was adopted by the Church, there was no such thing as *Popery* in the world. But the *name* is found to be of great use in amusing weak people, who have no ready stock of learning to contradict them, and, in some cases, I fear no good desire of being better informed. Who can think it a notable proof of their *zeal* as *Protestants*, that they take a pleasure in seeing their poor Mother, the *Episcopal* church of *England*, the honour of the Reformation, and the dread of *Popery*, painted and dressed up for a *Jezebel* by men of *her own household*; who have shipwreckt their Consciences by subscribing Articles they never believed, and are growing fat upon the provision allotted by the Providence of God, only to support the Church in her Journey through this world to the kingdom of heaven. A sight that would raise the Indignation of a *Mahometan*! and almost move a *Papist* himself to pity and pray for us!

But I would hope there are some few among the favourers of *Arianism*, who are not gone quite so far out of the way, and would be ashamed of such low and

D 2

base

condemnation of *Arius*, “*a famous contest* ;” as if one half of the world had been divided against the other. And he says it was “*determined by a majority of near twenty to one* ;” whereas, in truth, there were but *five* out of *three hundred and eighteen*, who denied the *Catholic Faith*. I mention this to shew how some things may be *represented* by some sorts of people, who, if they are not *ignorant*, must think it their *Interest* to *impose* upon you. What would you think of a man, who having been present at an *Affize*, should bring a report of it home to his family, and tell them he had been at a *famous Contest*, where there was a *majority of near ten* Jury-men, six witnesses, and a Judge, against the *criminal*? See *Ded.* to an *Essay on Spirit*, p. 9. 10.

¹ *Essay on Spirit*, p. 151.

base Artifices, as can only serve to expose and discredit their cause with any man of common learning and honesty. To these I address myself: and now the *Scripture* is before us, let me ask them a plain question or two. Is not the word *Essence* or *Substance* of the same signification with the word *nature*? and have not the Fathers of the Church thus expounded it? and is not this Phrase—*of the same Nature*—as conclusive for the *Divinity* of *Christ*, as that other—*of the same Substance*? Why then should that expression of the *Nicene Creed* be thought so offensive, when there is another in the *Scripture* so near of kin to it, that the *Arians* must be sensible they could gain nothing by the Exchange? for the *divine nature*, we all agree, can be but *one*; *three divine natures* of course making *three* different *Gods*. But the *Scripture*, compared as above, has asserted *Christ* to be *of this divine nature*. And if people were once persuaded of that, all farther disputes about the word *Consubstantial* would be at an end. But peace and unity for *Christ's* sake, is a blessing of which God has deprived this Church for the punishment of its sins: and as we do not seem to be in any posture of repentance, it is to be feared he will never restore it to us again in this world; but suffer us to go on from bad to worse, till the measure is filled up.

XLV.

It is a rule laid down by St. *Paul*, that GOD swears by HIMSELF, for this reason, *because he can swear by NO GREATER*. *Heb. vi. 13.*

But, *Christ* has sworn by himself:

Isa. xlv. 23. I have sworn by MYSELF,—that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear.

Which words being compared with *Rom. xiv. 10. 11.* are proved to be the words of *Christ*—*We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ: For it is written, as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess unto God.*

Christ,

Christ, therefore has *sworn* by HIMSELF: so that if the Apostle's rule be applied, he must for this reason be GOD, and there can be NO GREATER.

XLVI.

Eph. iv. 8. When HE (*Christ*) ascended up on high, HE led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.

Yet the Scripture here referred to, expressly affirms the person who *ascended*, &c. to be the *Lord God*.

Psal. lxxviii. 17, 18. The chariots of GOD are twenty thousand, even thousands of Angels: the LORD is among them, as in *Sinai*, in the holy Place. THOU *hast ascended on high*, THOU *hast led captivity captive*, &c.

XLVII.

Heb. ix. 20. This is the Blood of the TESTAMENT which GOD hath *enjoined* you.

Ibid. v. 16. Where a TESTAMENT is, there must also of necessity be the DEATH of the TESTATOR.

God is a *Testator*: but, argues the *Apostle*, every *Testator* must *die*, before the last Will or *Testament* *enjoined* by him, can be of *force*. Therefore, if you keep close to the terms, the natural conclusion is, that GOD, being a *Testator*, should *die*, to make way for the *execution* of his *Testament*. But it being impossible that the divine nature of God should be capable of *Death*; it follows, that the *person* who *was* capable of *Death*, and did *die* as a *man*, was also God the *Testator*. And it is to express the strict and perfect union of the *two natures* in the *single person* of *Christ*, that what is true only of *one*, is predicated of *both*. Of this, two more examples should be added in the articles that immediately follow.

XLVIII.

Rev. v. 9. THOU wast slain, and hast redeemed
US TO GOD BY THY BLOOD.

A Distinction is here observed between the two natures of *Christ*: and the act of *redeeming* us by the *shedding of his blood* is ascribed to the *Lamb*, the *Messiah's Humanity*. But in another place it is imputed to his Divinity—*Feed the Church of GOD, which he hath purchased with HIS OWN BLOOD*¹: not that *God*, strictly speaking, has any *blood of his own* to shed; but that he who shed his blood for us *as man*, was *God* as well as *man*: or in other words, that *God* and *man* were united in the *same person*; something being predicated of *God*, which cannot possibly be true without such an union. So again—

XLIX.

Zech. xii. 4.—In that day, saith THE LORD—*v. 10.*
—they shall look on ME whom they have
PIERCED.

But, according to the Evangelist *St. John*, this *Scripture saith*,

John xix. 37. They shall look on HIM (*Christ*)
whom they have PIERCED.

As it stands in the Prophet, the *Lord (Jehovah)* was to be *pierced*. So that unless the man *Christ*, who hung upon the Cross, was also the *Lord Jehovah*, the Evangelist is found to be a false witness, in applying to him a prophecy that could not possibly be fulfilled in him.

L.

Phil. i. 10. That ye may be sincere and without
offence, till the DAY OF CHRIST.

2 *Pet. iii. 12.* Looking for and hasting to the
coming of the DAY OF GOD.

LI.

¹ *Acts xx. 18.*

LI.

Isa. xl. 10. *Behold*, the LORD GOD will COME
— HIS REWARD IS WITH HIM.

Rev. xxii. 12. *Behold*, I (*Jesus*) COME quickly,
and MY REWARD IS WITH ME.

Amen: even so come, LORD JESUS.

CHAP. II. *The DIVINITY of the* H O L Y G H O S T.

John iii. 6. Το γεγεννημενον εκ τῆ Πνευματος—That
which is BORN OF the SPIRIT.

I *John* v. 4. Το γεγεννημενον εκ τῆ Θεου—whatsoever is
BORN OF GOD.

The same individual act of divine Grace, viz. that of our spiritual birth, is ascribed, without the change of a single Letter, to *God*, and to the *Spirit*. Some capacity then there must be, wherein the *Scripture* makes no distinction between *God* and the *Spirit*:—and this is what the *Scripture* itself calls the *divine nature*; under which *God* and the *Spirit* are both equally comprehended.

II.

Acts xiii. 2. The HOLY GHOST said, separate ME *Barnabas* and *Saul* for the work whereunto I HAVE CALLED them.

Heb. v. 4. No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is CALLED OF GOD.

The shorter way is to ask this same *Saul*, who it was that appointed him to the work of the ministry? and his answer is no other than this—*Paul* CALLED to be an *Apostle*, SEPARATED unto the *Gospel*—By the commandment of GOD OUR SAVIOUR¹.

¹ *Rom.* i. 1. and *1 Tim.* i. 1.

III.

Matth. ix. 38. PRAY ye therefore the LORD OF THE HARVEST, that HE will SEND FORTH *Labourers* into his harvest.

Acts xiii. 4. So they being SENT FORTH BY THE HOLY GHOST.

In this act of *sending forth Labourers* upon the *work* of the Gospel, the *Holy Ghost* is proved to be the *Lord of the harvest*, to whom *Christ* himself has directed us to PRAY. Wherefore, they are not to be heard, who advise us to alter the *third petition* in the *Litany*; a *work*, to which I am sure the *Holy Ghost* hath not called us, and such as will never be consented to by any *Labourers* of *his* sending.

IV.

Luke ii. 26. And it was revealed unto him (*vna a*) BY the HOLY GHOST, that he should not see Death, before he had seen the Lords *Christ*.

Ibid. v. 28. And he BLESSED GOD, and said, LORD now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word.

This *word*, was the *word* of the *Holy Ghost*; who therefore is entitled to the context, and is *God* and *Lord* to be *blest* or *praised*; not under any imaginary restrictions and limitations, according to a certain degree of Power delegated to him: an evasion you will meet with in some modern writers, but the Scripture, and common reason

^a I set down the *preposition*, because it slays the *Arian* with his own weapon. It shews the prime *agency* and *authority* in this affair to have been that of the *Holy Ghost*, acting in his own right, and not as the *minister* or *instrument* of an higher power; for then, according to them, it should have been *his*. For my own part, I lay no stress upon it; because I perceive, upon a review of the Scripture, that these two prepositions are often used indiscriminately.

reason instructed by the Scripture, disclaim and abhor it, as an inlet to all sorts of *Idolatry*.

V.

John xiv. 17. HE (*the SPIRIT of Truth*) dwelleth with you and shall be IN YOU.

1 Cor. xiv. 25. GOD is IN YOU of a truth.

VI.

2 Tim. iii. 16. All Scripture is given by INSPIRATION of GOD.

2 Pet. i. 21. Holy men of God spake as they were MOVED BY the HOLY GHOST.

VII.

John vi. 45. It is written in the prophets, and they shall be all TAUGHT of GOD.

1 Cor. ii. 13. Not in the words which *mans* wisdom teacheth, but which the HOLY GHOST TEACHETH.

This latter verse would prove the *Holy Ghost* to be *God* by itself: for I cannot find that *man*, in the style of the Scripture, is ever *opposed* in this manner to any *being* but *God* only. I will subjoin a few examples of it.

John i. 13.—*Nor of the will of man, but of God.*

1 Theff. iv. 8. *He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God.*

Rom. i. 29. *Whose praise is not of men, but of God.*

VIII.

Acts v. 3. Why hath *Satan* filled thine heart to LYE to the HOLY GHOST.

Acts v. 4.—Thou hast not LYED unto *men*, but unto GOD.

Dr. *Clarke* affirms, that “the Person of the *Holy Ghost* is no where in Scripture expressly stiled *God*.” And then

then adds, by way of authority—"see the Text, No. 66."¹ And what *text* would you suppose this to be? why, it is no other than that of *Acts* v. 4. where he IS *expressly styled God*. The *Doctor* refers us to it, because he has added a long perplexed Comment, to help us to *understand* it, I suppose; though a child may see the force of it without any Comment at all. The substance of all he has said may be reduced to this—"Ananias lyed to God, because he lyed to the Apostles, in whom God dwelt by his Spirit." Thus he has tried to evade it; even by producing *one* proof of the *Holy Ghost's Divinity*, as an answer to *another*. For if the Scripture assures us that God dwelleth in us, and our only argument for it, is, because the Spirit dwelleth in us; who can the Spirit be, but God himself? as it is proved in the following Article. But before we proceed to it, I must beg the Reader to observe how he has used and represented *Athanasius's* opinion upon this text. "*Athanasius* himself (says the Doctor²) explains this text in the same manner: He that lyed (saith he) to the Holy Ghost, lyed to GOD, WHO dwelleth in men by his Spirit. For³ where the Spirit of God is, there is GOD." The Difference, then, between this author and St. *Athanasius*, is no more than this: the former takes occasion to deny that the *Holy Ghost* is GOD, the latter to prove it, and both from one and the same text; which, if you believe the *Doctor*, they have explained in the same manner!

IX.

¹ *John* iii. 21. Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward GOD.

Ibid. v. 24. And hereby we know that HE abideth in us, by THE SPIRIT which he hath given us.

The Apostle's reasoning is this—"The Spirit abideth in us; and hereby we know that He (God) abideth in us." But unless the Spirit be a person in the Unity of God, the conclusion is manifestly false.

X.

¹ Part II. §. XXXII. ² No. 66. ³ Οπου γαρ εστι το Πνευμα του Θεου, εκει εστιν ο ΘΕΟΣ.

X.

I *Cor.* iii. 16. The TEMPLE of GOD is holy, which temple are YE.

I *Ibid.* vi. 19. Know ye not, that YOUR BODIES are the TEMPLE of the HOLY GHOST.

XI.

Matth. iv. 1. Then was *Jesus* LED up (*υπο*) BY THE SPIRIT, to be TEMPTED, &c.

Luke xi. 2—4. OUR FATHER which art in heaven—LEAD US NOT INTO TEMPTATION.

It is not my business in this place to shew particularly in *what manner* and for *what end* God leads us into temptation. That it is no way consistent with the divine attributes, is plain from the case now before us: for *Jesus* was led up into the wilderness to meet his adversary and be tempted by him. And it is also plain from that petition in the Lord's Prayer, that *our Father which is in heaven* would not lead us into temptation; it being needless and absurd to pray that God would not do, what, by the necessity of his nature, it is impossible for him to do. In this case, God is not the tempter: he only introduces us to the trial; and always provides, if we have the grace and prudence to embrace it, a way for our escaping that we may be able to bear it.

But when *Jesus* was tempted, the leading him into temptation was the act of the *Holy Spirit*. Therefore, as often as we repeat the *Lord's Prayer*, we address ourselves inclusively to the *Person* of the *Spirit*, under the one name of OUR FATHER: and certainly, he also is *our Father*, of whom we are begotten and born, even of the *Spirit*: and again, as many as are LED by the SPIRIT of God, they are the SONS of God. *Rom.* viii. 14. See Art. I. of this Chapter.

XII.

I *Cor.* i. 3. Blessed be GOD, even the GOD of ALL COMFORT.

If

If all spiritual Comfort (sent from heaven) be of God, how is it consistent, that *the Churches had rest—walking in the COMFORT OF the HOLY GHOST*,¹ unless the *Holy Ghost* be a person in the Unity of God? and how can *he* be styled by way of Eminence, *THE Comforter*,² if there be a God distinct from him, who claims that Title? for then he is not *the Comforter*, but *one of the two*; and *two divine Comforters*, like *two Almightyies*, would make *two Gods*; which is not a principle of Christianity, but of heathen Idolatry. And the same reasoning will hold good as to another of his titles. For the *Holy Ghost* is called, by way of Eminence, *THE SPIRIT*,³ i. e. the true and principal, the head and Father of all *other Spirits*. Yet we are told that *God is a Spirit*;⁴ so that unless the *Spirit* be also *God*, we must believe in *two* supreme distinct, and independent *Spirits*. And thus we justly argue for the Divinity of *Christ*; that because *GOD is LIGHT*,⁵ and *Christ is THE LIGHT*,⁶ therefore he is and must be *God*; even the *TRUE God*, because he is the *TRUE Light*.⁷

XIII.

I Cor. ii. 11. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the SPIRIT of a man which is IN HIM? EVEN so the things of GOD knoweth (αὐτοῦ) none but the SPIRIT of GOD.

The *Spirit* of a man knows the things of a man for *this* reason, because it is *in him*. For the *same* reason, the *Spirit* of God knows the things of God, because it is *in the Godhead*; than which nothing farther need be desired to prove the *co-essentiality* of the *Holy Ghost*.⁸ If you take it otherwise, there can be no

¹ Acts ix. 3.² Ὁ παρακλητὴς.

John xiv. 26.

³ 1 John v. 6. ⁴ Ibid. iv. 24. ⁵ 1 John i. 5. ⁶ John i. 4, 7, 8, and viii. 12. ⁷ John i. 9. ⁸ The Scripture uses the same preposition to denote the co-essentiality of Christ—John xiv. 11. *I am* (ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ) *In the Father*. And xiii. 32. *God shall glorify him* (ἐν αὐτῷ) *In Himself*.

parallel between the two cases. For how strange would it be to say—the *human Spirit* knows the things of a *man*, because it is *in him*; EVEN SO, the *Divine Spirit* knows the things of *God*, because it is *out of him*. This text brings the matter to a short issue. The Church affirms the *Spirit* to be *in God*, as a *person* of the *same divine nature*: the *Arians* deny it, and will understand him to be *out of God*; not a *person* of the *divine nature*, but one *inferior* to, and *distinct* from it. To see on which side the truth lies, a man needs no other qualification but that of *faith*, to receive the *Scripture* as the *infallible word of God*; which the *Arians*, in most of their writings, have very freely confessed it to be. If once they come openly to deny this, they are no longer *Arians*, but *infidels* of another denomination, with whom a different course is to be taken.

XIV.

I Cor. ii. 11. The THINGS OF GOD knoweth no man.

Ibid. v. 14. But the natural man receiveth not the THINGS OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD.

Here again, the Scripture makes no distinction, farther than that of personality, between *God* and the *Spirit of God*; but renders unto *God* the *things* that are *God's*, by rendering them to the *Spirit*, who *is God*.

XV.

Deut. vi. 16. and Matt. iv. 7. Thou shalt not TEMPT the LORD thy GOD.

Acts v. 9. How is it that ye have agreed to TEMPT the SPIRIT of the LORD?

The Spirit is here substituted as the object of that particular act of disobedience, of which, according to the *Law* and the *Gospel*, the only object is the *Lord our God*: therefore the *Spirit* is the *Lord our God*.

Dr.

Dr. Clarke denies that in “*any place of Scripture there is any mention made of any SIN against the Holy Ghost but only of a BLASPHEMY,*”¹ He that can distinguish BLASPHEMY from SIN, must be an acute reasoner; when it is of *all sins the greatest*. But it is no SIN against the *Holy Ghost*, to *lye* to him, to *grieve* him² or to *tempt* him? why then did the Lord *swear* in his *wrath* against those that *grieved* him, if it were no SIN? and why was that commandment given in the Law, *thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God*? And if the *Spirit* be *tempted*, is not *the Spirit* the object *offended* by that *temptation*? This is the very thing that learned man was afraid of. He would have proved *blasphemy* to be no *Sin*, lest the *Spirit* should appear to be the *object* of *Sin*; for that would have proved him to be *God*, the author and giver of the *Law*: and that, again, would have spoilt his *Scripture Doctrine*: so the short way was, to *deny* it.

XVI.

Gen. iv. 3. And the LORD said, MY SPIRIT shall not *always strive with man*.

The *Spirit of the Lord* strove with the Inhabitants of the old world, endeavouring to reclaim them by grace, and *waiting* long for their repentance. But this is called, 1 Pet. iii. 20. The *long suffering* of God that *waited* in the days of *Noah*.

XVII.

Luke xi. 20. If I with the FINGER of GOD *cast out Devils*.

The parallel place in St. *Matthew's Gospel* has it thus;

Matth. xii. 28. If I with the SPIRIT of GOD *cast out Devils*.

¹ S. D. p. 212.

² Eph. iv. 30.

The *finger of God* is a metaphorical expression for the immediate *power* and *agency* of God: and to say, that *Devils were cast out* by the *finger of God*, is the same as to say, that they were cast out by *God himself*. But it appears from the text of *St. Matthew*, that this particular act of the *finger of God*, that is, of *God himself*, was the act of the SPIRIT; therefore, the *Spirit* is *God himself*.

XVIII.

Ezech. viii. 1—3. The hand of the LORD GOD fell there upon me—and HE (the *Lord God*) put forth the form of an hand and *took me* by a lock of mine head, and the SPIRIT *lift me up*, &c.

In this text, the name of the *Lord God*, and the name of the *Spirit*, do both belong to the same *person*. For though it be said that the *Spirit lifted up* the prophet, yet was it no other than the *Lord God* who *put forth the form of an hand and took him*: therefore the SPIRIT is the LORD GOD.

XIX.

Acts iv. 24, 25.—They lift up their voice to God with one accord, and said, LORD, *thou art God*, which hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that therein is. WHO *by the mouth* of thy servant DAVID hast said, &c.

The terms LORD and GOD are here used to express the Divinity of *him*, who spake *by the mouth* of his servant *David*. But it was the *person* of the HOLY GHOST, who spake *by the mouth* of his servant *David*—for, saith *St. Peter*,—*This Scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the HOLY GHOST by the mouth of DAVID spake*, &c. Therefore, the terms LORD and GOD are certainly used to *express the Divinity* of the HOLY GHOST.

So

So again ;

It was the LORD GOD of *Israel*, who SPAKE by the mouth of his holy *Prophets*, since the world began. *Luke* i. 68, 70.

But then, it is written—well SPAKE the HOLY GHOST by *Esaías* the prophet, ¹ &c. Therefore, the *Holy Ghost* is the LORD GOD of *Israel*.

XX.

Psal. cxxxix. 7. Whither shall I go from THY SPIRIT? or whither shall I go from thy *Pre-
sence*? If I ascend up into heaven, THOU art there.

The Psalmist, to acknowledge the omnipresence of the *Holy Ghost*, says—*Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?* and by what is immediately subjoined, he shews this to be the omnipresence of *God himself*—*If I ascend up into heaven, THOU art there.* So that the terms *Thou*, and *thy Spirit*, are equivalent; i. e. equally conclusive for the immediate *presence* of the *divine nature itself*.

XXI.

It was said by the Angel—*Luke* i. 32.—*He shall be great, and shall be called the SON of the HIGHEST.* But the reason given upon this occasion WHY Christ was called the SON OF GOD, is this, and this only, viz. because he was begotten by the *Holy Ghost*—“ The
“ *Holy Ghost* shall come upon thee, and the Power of
“ the HIGHEST shall overshadow thee: THERE-
“ FORE also that holy thing which shall be born of
“ thee shall be called the Son of GOD.” v. 35.

When *Jesus* is called the *Son of God*, we understand the *supreme* and *true God*, besides whom there is no other. The *Devils* themselves allowed it, and said—“ *Jesus*, thou Son of God, MOST HIGH!” ² But whose Son *Jesus* is said to be in this place, is the *Holy Ghost*, by

¹ *Acts* xxviii. 25.

² *Luke* viii. 28.

whose

whose *Power* (called the *Power of the highest*) he was begotten of the blessed virgin, and thence called the *Son of God*.

Therefore, the *Holy Ghost* is *God*, and the *Highest*.

XXII.

The Prophet *Isaiah*, in his 6th Chapter, tells us he saw the LORD OF HOSTS. And at v. 8. that he heard the voice of the LORD, SAYING—*Go and tell this people, hear ye indeed but understand not, &c.*

Yet these very words, which the prophet declares to have been *spoken* by the *Lord*, even the *Lord of hosts*, were spoken by the *Holy Ghost*—Well SPAKE the HOLY GHOST, by *Esaias the Prophet, unto our Fathers*, saying, *Go unto this people and say, hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand,* ¹ &c.

Therefore, the HOLY GHOST is the LORD OF HOSTS.

The article of the Holy Ghost's supreme and absolute Divinity, being now established in the plainest terms; I shall proceed to answer, from the Scripture, the objections usually made against it from thence.

XXIII.

† *Mattb.* xix. 17. There is none good but ONE, that is GOD.

If this be a good objection to the Divinity of *Christ*, it must be equally strong against that of the Holy Ghost, for it is argued from this passage, that the attribute of *goodness* is confined to the *single person* of God the Father; who therefore is a Being superior to, and different from *Christ* and the *Holy Ghost*. The Error of this argument has been fully shewn above: for it is not *one person*, but *one God*, whom the Scripture has asserted to be *good*; and I have now an opportunity of confirming it, and of proving withal, that in the unity of this one God,

¹ *Acts* xxviii. 26, 27.

besides whom no other is *good*, the person of the Holy Ghost is, and must be, included. For it is written — *Thy SPIRIT is GOOD* ¹ — so that if the same inspired Scripture which declares the person of the *Spirit* to be *good*, does also as plainly declare that *none is good*, but *God only*; then the Spirit is God, even the only true and supreme God; and we are as well assured of it, as if it had been said, “there is none good but one, that is *the Spirit*, who is one with God.” The Hebrew in this place is yet stronger than the English. It is not טוב *good*, but טובה *Goodness itself*, that is, divine essential uncommunicated goodness, besides which there neither is nor can be any other of the like kind. There is one sort of goodness communicated to men upon earth; as we read, *Psal. cxii. 5. the good man sheweth favour, &c.* and *Acts xi. 24. that Barnabas was a good man, and full of faith, &c.* There is another sort of goodness to be found only in heaven, and that is the goodness of God, which is essential; but this goodness is also an attribute of the *Spirit*; who therefore is proved to be *very God*; and by that argument too, for the sake of which, some, have *denied* him to be God.

XXIV.

† *Matth. iii. 16. The Spirit of God.*

The Spirit, say they, is not *God*, because he is only the Spirit of God. But so likewise the *human Spirit*, whence the Apostle has taught us to borrow an Idea of the *Divine*, is the Spirit OF a man; yet, was it ever pretended, that the *Spirit*, for this reason, is *one Being*, and the *man* another? No, certainly; and the same must be true of *God*, and the Spirit of God; as far as the Being of the *same man*, who is *one person*, can be an image of the *same God*, who is *three persons*. But there is the plainest testimony of Scripture that the Spirit, though said to

¹ *Psal. cxliii. 10.*

be the *Spirit OF Jehovah*, is also called by the express name of *Jehovah* himself. For it is written, *Judg. xv. 14.* that the *Spirit OF Jehovah* CAME upon *Samson*. Yet at *Chap. xvi. 20.* it is said, that *Jehovah* himself DEPARTED from him. Till it can be shewn, then, that the person who departed from him was another; it is undeniable, that the *Spirit*, though said to be OF *Jehovah*, is strictly and properly *Jehovah* himself.

XXV.

† *Heb. ii. 4.* God also bearing them witness with —gifts of the *Holy Ghost* according to his own WILL.

Hence it is objected, that the *Holy Ghost* is subservient and subordinate to the WILL of another; therefore he cannot be the supreme and true God. But if this own will of God should prove to be no other than the will of the *Spirit*, this imaginary objection of the *Arians*, which if it be an error must also be a blasphemy, will turn to a demonstration against them. And that the will of God really is the will of the *Spirit*, is manifest from *1 Cor. xii. 11.* *All these worketh that one and the self same SPIRIT, dividing to every man severally as HE (even he himself) WILLETH.*

XXVI.

† *Rom. viii. 26.* The *Spirit* itself maketh intercession for us.

The *Spirit* is not God, because he maketh intercession with God; and God, as it is imagined, cannot intercede with himself. But it is a matter of fact, that he has actually done this; therefore it is wicked and false to say that he cannot. For God reconciled the world TO HIMSELF, and it was done by *Intercession*.

The other Objections I meet with, are all of this stamp; as that the Spirit is said to be *given*, to *proceed*, to be *poured out*, to be *sent*; and they argue that it is impossible for God to *give*, to *proceed* from, or to *send*, *himself*. But here the question is begged, that *God* is but *one person*, in which case it might be a contradiction: but the Scriptures demonstrate, as it will be seen in the following Chapter, that *God* is *three persons*; and then there is no contradiction in any of these things. It is also to be observed, that the *giving*, *proceeding*, *sending*, and *ministration* of the *Eternal Spirit* to *Christ* in *Glory*, are terms that concern not the *divine nature*, but relate merely to the *acts* and *offices*, which the several *persons* of the blessed *Trinity* have mercifully condescended to take upon them, for conducting the present OEconomy of man's *redemption* and *sanctification*.

By this time, I take it for granted, every pious reader must have observed, how copious and conclusive the *Scriptures* of the *old Testament* are upon the subject of the *Trinity*; and that without having recourse to them upon every occasion, it is impossible for me or for any man to deal fairly and honestly by the *Apostolical Doctrine* of the Church of *England*. Our *Lord* himself has told us, that every *Scribe*, or teacher, *instructed into the kingdom of heaven*, should bring forth out of his treasure, things *NEW* and *OLD*.¹ It was his own practice. He appealed, at every turn, to the *Law*, the *Prophets* and the *Psalms*, for the testimony of his own doctrine; and the Church has followed his example, from the days of the *Apostles* almost down to the present times. And so far is the *old Testament* from being no part of the *Scripture*, that it is the book and the only book, the *Gospel* calls by the name of *the Scripture*. It was this book, which the *noble* and faithful *Beræans* searched every day of their lives, to see whether the *Gospel* of the *new Testament* was agreeable to it; with the intention, either to receive or reject it, as

¹ *Matth.* xiii. 52.

it should appear to be recommended by this Authority. It was this Book, for his skill in which, *Apollos* is praised as one *mighty in the Scriptures*; the same Scriptures, of which St. *Paul* was bold to affirm for the benefit of a brother-*Christian*, that they were *able to make him wise unto salvation, through Faith that is in Christ Jesus*. As long as *this Faith* flourished in the Church, these Scriptures were much read and profitably understood: but now it is dwindled into a dry lifeless System of Morality, they are become in a manner useless; and some (it grieves me to say it) even of those who have undertaken to *teach others*, want themselves to be *taught again* this first Element of Christianity, that the *new Testament* can never be understood and explained, but by comparing it with the *Old*.

Of this Error and its consequences, we have a sad example in the celebrated Dr. *Clarke*; a man, whose talents might have adorned the Doctrine of Christ, had not his *Faith* been eaten up by an Heathen Spirit of Imagination and Philosophy. He published a Book entitled—*The Scripture doctrine of the Trinity*; a work of great pains and premeditation. In a short preface, he allows the Subject to be *of the greatest importance in Religion—not to be treated of carelessly—but examined by a serious study of the WHOLE SCRIPTURE*. And to convince the world, that this and no other was *his own* practice, he affirms in his *Introduction*, p. 17. and prints it in *capitals*, that he has collected *ALL the Texts* relating to that matter. Yet his whole Collection is finished and shut up without a single Text from the *old Testament*! I cannot find that he has even mentioned such a Book. “The Christian Revelation,” says he, p. 1. “is the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles.” This he calls, p. 4.—“The Books of Scripture;”—and again, p. 5.—“The Books of Scripture—not only the Rule, but the Whole and the Only Rule of Truth—the only foundation we have to go upon.” And he proves it thus—“because no man has since pretended to have any new Revelation.” An argument that will prejudice few people in favour of

his sincerity. For though there has been no *new Revelation* SINCE the Books of the new Testament, as we all confess; does it follow that there was no *old Revelation* BEFORE them? and did this author never read, that the same God, *who spake in these last days by his Son, spake in time past unto the fathers by the Prophets?* ¹ yet he affects to know nothing at all of the matter.

And as to the use he makes of the *New Testament*, who would expect, that a man who has made *Nothing* of one *half* of God's Revelation, should be very nice in his treatment of the *other*? In the first place, he has not vouchsafed to follow the Apostle's Direction of *comparing spiritual things with spiritual*, thence to collect their true meaning; but sets down his Texts in such an order, as makes them to be all single and independent of one another; and that gives all possible liberty to the Imagination to trust in what sort of comment it pleases. When he refers to any parallel place (which I think is *never* done, but on *one* side of the Question) the Reader is not directed to the text itself, but to the *meaning* he has fastened upon it. At the beginning of every Chapter, he sets down his *own opinion* at large, as the *Title* of it: and you are to believe, that all the passages of that Division do certainly prove it; which if cleared of his comments, and compared with other texts, are found to prove no such thing, but the very contrary. And this he calls *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*: but if we call it by its true name, it is—Clarke's *Doctrine of the Scripture*; that is, of *half* the Scripture. How it came to pass, that he should thus boldly set down his own resolutions upon the most profound article of the *Christian Faith*, without consulting *all* the Evidence that relates to it, or rightly examining *any part* of it; *how* this came to pass, God is to determine, to whom all things are naked and open. All I have to do with him, is to rescue the *Word of God* from such *deceitful handling*. And I have prevailed with myself to make these few Reflections, because I find some modern Ob-

¹ Heb. i. 1.

jectors of a lower Class, have used this Book in Conversation and in Print, as the Oracle of the Party, taking the *Scripture* upon trust as his principles would give him leave to retail it. I know it will be accounted an *hard thing*, and called *invidious*, to rake thus into the *Ashes* of a writer, who is not alive to answer for himself. And I confess, I am very far from taking any *pleasure* in it. But is it not much *harder*, that the ashes of this man should be scattered over the land, to breed and inflame the plague of heresy, till the whole *head* is sick and the *heart faint*, and the *whole body* full of putrifying blains and sores? *Arianism* is now no longer a *pestilence* that walketh in *darkness*, but that brazens it out against the sun's light, and *destroyeth* in the *noon day*. It is a *canker*, which if it be *encouraged* much longer, will certainly *eat out* the vitals of *Christianity* in this kingdom: and when the *faith* is gone, the *Church* in all probability will soon follow after it; for if the holy oil be wasted and spilt, the Lamp that was made to hold it, will be of no farther use.

C H A P. III. *The Plurality and Trinity of Persons.*

I.

That *Hebrew* name so often used in the *old Testament*, which we have translated by the Word *God*, is *Elohim*, a noun substantive of the *plural* number, regularly formed from its *singular* †, and very frequently joined with plural verbs and plural adjectives, to express a *plurality* in the divine nature: though for another obvious reason, it is generally constructed with verbs and pronouns of the *singular* number, and gives a good sense, though the Grammar of it be somewhat irregular.

† אֱלֹהִים and אֱלֹה; see the *Heb.* of *Deut.* xxxii. 17. and *Heb.* i. 11.

The *Jews* would persuade us not to consider this word as a plural noun, but on some particular occasions. Whoever will be at the pains to examine their reasoning, will find it to be very childish and inconsistent, wholly owing to their hatred against the divinity of *Jesus Christ*, and the notion of a Trinity. But when the *Jew* is become a *Christian*, and the stumbling-block of the *Cross* removed out of his way, he can allow the name *Elohim* to be *plural* as readily as other men; and it is one of the principal points he chuses to insist upon, to convince the world that his eyes are open, and he is sincere in his profession of the *Christian* religion.

John Xeres, a *Jew* converted here in *England* about forty years ago, published a sensible and affectionate address to his unbelieving brethren, wherein he lays before them his *reasons for leaving the Jewish religion and embracing the Christian*. “The Christians (says he*) confess *Jesus* to be *God*; and it is this that makes us look upon the Gospels as books that overturn the very principles of religion, the truth of which is built upon this article, the *Unity of God*. In this argument lies the strength of what you object against the Christian religion” &c. Then he undertakes to prove, that the unity of *God* is not such as he once understood it to be, an unity of *Person*, but of *Essence*, under which more persons than one are comprehended; and the first proof he offers is that of the name *Elohim*. “Why else, says he†, is that frequent mention of *God* by nouns of the plural number? as in *Gen. i. 1.* where the word *Elohim* which is rendered *God*, is of the plural number, though annexed to a verb of the singular number; which demonstrates as evidently as may be, that there are several persons partaking of the same divine nature and essence.”

* P. 53.

† P. 57.

II.

Gen. i. 26. And GOD said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness.

No sensible reason can be given, why God should speak of himself in the *plural* number, unless he consists of more persons than one. Dr. *Clarke* contrived the plan of his *Scripture-Doctrine*, so as to leave out this difficulty with many more of the same kind. Others there are who tell us it is a figurative way of speaking, only to express the dignity of God, not to denote any *plurality* in him. For they observe it is customary for a King, who is only one person, to speak of himself in the same Style. But how absurd is it, that God should borrow his way of speaking from a king, before a man was created upon the earth! And even granting this to be possible, yet the cases will not agree. For though a King or Governor may say *us* and *we*, there is certainly no figure of speech that will allow any single person to say, *one of us*, when he speaks only of *himself*. It is a phrase that can have no meaning, unless there be more persons than one to chuse out of. Yet this is the Style in which God has spoken of himself in the following article—

III.

Gen. iii. 22. And the LORD GOD said, behold the man is become like ONE OF US.

The *Jews* are greatly perplexed with this passage. They endeavour to put it off, by telling us, God must here be understood to speak of himself and his *council*, or as they term it בֵּית דִּין his *house of judgment*, made up of angels, &c. to which there needs no answer but that of the prophet, *who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counsellor*¹.

¹ *Rom. xi. 34. & Isai. xl. 13.*

IV. *Gen.*

IV.

Gen. xi. 6, 7. And the LORD said—let us go down and there confound (*Heb. let us confound*) their language.

Another instance of this occurs in *Isaiah vi. 8.* *I heard the voice of the LORD, saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for us?* Upon the plural word *Nobis, us*, there is a short note of *Junius* and *Tremellius*, which contains the substance of all that can be said upon the occasion—*“ Nam consilium est Dei Patris, Filii, & Spiritus Sancti”* For this (say they) is a consultation of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost—And it shall be proved to be so, in a proper place, from an inspired comment upon this Chapter of *Isaiah*.

V.

Gen. xx. 13. And it came to pass when GOD caused me to wander from my fathers house, &c.

The Hebrew is—*Deus errare facerent*—God they caused me to wander: which, however strange it may sound to an English hearer, is the strict grammatical rendering of the original. And the expression is affirmed by *Junius* and *Tremellius*, with other commentators out of number, to respect the plurality of the persons in the Godhead. They have a short note upon it to the following effect—*Plurale verbum cum Dei nomine, ad indicandum S. Triados mysterium*: which I mention, not in the way of an authority, but only to shew how clear the case is to an Hebrew reader, whose mind is without prejudice. And though others may have attempted to conceal such evidence as this under an heap of critical rubbish, yet if we are to come to no resolution, till those who dislike the doctrine of a trinity have done disputing about the words that convey it, the day of judgment itself would find us undetermined. And if we would but attend to this state of the case, and apply it also to other points of doctrine, I am well

well convinced it would shorten many of our disputes, and make the word of God a much more easy and intelligible book than it passes for at present.

VI.

Gen. xxv. 7. Because there GOD appeared unto him, &c.

Here again the *Hebrew* verb is plural—*Deus revelati sunt*—God they appeared, or were revealed to him. So again in 2 *Sam. vii. 23*—even like Israel whom God went to redeem; which in the original is—*iverunt Deus ad redimendum*; the verb being in the plural. A celebrated *Latin* translator¹ of the old testament has ventured to render it—*iverunt Dii ad redimendum*: but *Dii* in latin is not answerable to *Elohim* in the *Hebrew*; and, in strictness, may be thought to countenance the notion of *Tritheism* or a plurality of Gods; which is abhorrent from the express doctrine of the scripture; and against which the name *Elohim* is purposely guarded, by its being connected so very often with verbs and pronouns in the singular.

VII.

Deut. iv. 7. What nation is there so great, that hath GOD so nigh unto them? &c.

In the two preceding articles we have seen the name of God connected with plural verbs: it is here joined to a plural adjective, whose termination is the same with its own; for the original has it.—*Elohim Kerebim*—*Deus propinqui*—God who are so near. Another instance of which we have in *Josh. xxiv. 19.* *Ye cannot serve the Lord, for he is an holy God.* For the *Hebrew* reads it—*Deus sancti ipse*,—he is a God who are holy ones. And again *Psal. lviii. 12* Doubtless there is a God that judgeth the earth: the *Hebrew* of which is—*Deus judicantes in terra*—a God (i. e. divine persons) who are judging in the earth.

¹ *Pagninus* in his interlineary version published by *Montanus*.
VIII.

VIII.

Several other nouns there are beside the name *Elohim*, as well adjective as substantive, that are set down in the plural number, where it cannot be denied that the Being of *God* is to be understood by them.

Mal. i. 6. If I be a MASTER, where is my fear? The *Heb.* is אֲדֹנִים *Adonim*, in the plural—If I am masters, &c.

Isa. liv. 5. For thy Maker is thine husband, the Lord of Hosts is his name. Here also the Hebrew substantives for thy maker and thy husband are both plural—כַּעֲלִיךָ עֹשֶׂיךָ. And to prove that עֹשֶׂיךָ cannot signify thy maker in the singular number, it is also found connected with the word *Jehovah* in its singular form, without the ' inserted; as in *Isa. li. 13.* And forgettest the Lord thy maker—יְהוָה עֹשֶׂיךָ.

Eccl. xii. 1. Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth, &c. The Hebrew of which is —remember בּוֹרְאֶיךָ אֶת, thy Creators, in the plural. And there is nothing strange in this, when we can prove so easily that the world and all men in it were created by a Trinity.

Instead of the usual names of God, *adjectives* expressing some divine attribute are very frequently substituted; and these also occur in the plural, as in the following examples.

Prov. ix. 10. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge (קִדְשִׁים) of the HOLY ONES is understanding. Another instance of which may be found in *Chap. xxx. 3.* see also *Hosea xi. 12.* in the *Hebrew.* xii. 1.

Eccl. v. 8. There be HIGHER than they. The Hebrew is (גְּבוּהִים) high ones, in the plural; and is understood even by the Jews themselves to mean the holy and blessed God. Junius and Tremellius put *altissimus* in their text, but acknowledge the Hebrew to be *alti* —*plurale pro singulari superlativo, mysterium S. Triados notans.*

Psal.

Psal. lxxviii. 25. Man did eat Angels food.

The word (אֲבִירִים) *mighty ones*, is never used for *Angels*; and must in this place signify *God*, for the two following reasons. 1. Because *Abir* in the singular is several times used absolutely as a name of *God*; who is called *Abir Israel, the mighty one of Israel*, and *Abir Jacob, the mighty one of Jacob. Gen. xlix. 24. Psalm cxxxii. 2.* where the lxx. have rendered it *Deo*. 2. Because our blessed Saviour in discoursing upon the *Manna, John vi. 31—33*, quotes this part of the Psalm, and calls that *the bread of God from heaven*, which in the Psalm itself is called *the bread of the mighty*. Therefore *Abirim* is put for *Elohim*, and is taken in the plural because *God* is plural.

IX.

Dan. iv. 26. And whereas THEY commanded to leave the stump of the tree, roots, &c.

At the 13th verse of this Chapter, we read only of one *watcher* or *holy one* coming down from heaven, of whom it is said that He cried—*leave the stump of his roots in the earth*. Yet the number is here very remarkably changed from *he said* to *they commanded*. And though the words of the curse upon *Nebuchadnezzar* were pronounced by A *watcher* and An *holy one* in the singular; nevertheless, at the close of the speech, this *matter* is declared to be by the decree of the WATCHERS and the demand by the word of the HOLY ONES. ¹ Now it is very certain that the judgments of *God* are not founded upon the decree and word of *Angels* or of any created beings: therefore this *watcher* could be no created angel, but a person in the Lord *Jehovah*, who condescends to watch over ² his people, and is called the *keeper of Israel, that*

¹ V. 17. Compare this with *Prov. ix. 10.* cited in No. viii. of this chapter.

² *Jer. xxxi. 28.*

neither slumbereth nor sleepeth. The change of these verbs and nouns from the singular to the plural, can be accounted for upon no other principle : it is a case to which there is no parallel in any language, and such as can be reconcileable only to the Being of *God* who is *one* and *many*. We are to collect from it, that in this, as in every act of the Godhead, there was a consent and concurrence of the persons in the Trinity; and though there was *one* only who *spoke*, it was the *word* and *decree* of *all*. There is an instance of this sort in the new Testament. The Disciples of *Christ* were commanded to *baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. And without doubt, the baptism they administered was in all cases agreeable to the prescribed form. Nevertheless we are told of some, who were commanded to be *baptized in the name of the Lord* ², and particularly, in the *name of the Lord Jesus* ³: so that there was a strange defect either in the baptism itself, or in the account we have of it; or the mention of one person in the Trinity must *imply* the presence, name, and authority of them all.

X.

Dan. v. 18. The most high GOD gave to *Nebuchadnezzar* a kingdom and majesty and glory and honour.

V. 20. And THEY took his glory from him.

Here again, the word *they* is a plain relative to the *most high God*. Nor can it otherwise be agreeable to the sense of the history, or the reason of the thing itself considered as a matter of fact. For who was it that *took away* the glory of the king? It was not the work of *men*, but a supernatural act of *the most high God*; to whom *Nebuchadnezzar* himself hath ascribed it—*those that walk in pride He is able to abase*.

² *Acts* x. 48.

³ *Ibid.* viii. 16.

I might here subjoin, in proof of a *plurality*, those numerous passages of the old Testament, wherein God is spoken of, or speaks of himself, as of *more persons than one*. I will produce a few of them, to shew that such are not wanting. *Gen. xix. 24. The Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven. Psal. cx. 1. The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, &c. Dan. ix. 17. Now therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant—for the Lords sake. Prov. xxx. 4. Who hath established all the ends of the earth? What is his name, and what is his Sons name, if thou canst tell? Isa. x. 12. When the Lord hath performed his whole work upon Jerusalem I will punish, &c. Ibid. xiii. 13. I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the Lord of hosts, and in the day of his fierce anger. Ibid. xxii. 19. And I will drive thee from thy station, and from thy state shall he pull thee down. Ibid. lxiv. 4. Neither hath the eye seen, O God, beside thee, what he hath prepared for him that waiteth for him. Hos. i. 7. I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the Lord their God. Zech. ii. 10—11. I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord; and many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people; and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee. Ibid. x. 12. And I will strengthen them in the Lord, and they shall walk up and down in his name, saith the Lord.*

The Passages hitherto produced in this Chapter are designed only to prove an *indefinite* plurality in God. In the remaining part of it, I shall bring forward another class of texts, which shew this plurality to be a *Trinity*.

XI.

Psal. xxxiii, 6. By the word of the LORD were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath (Heb. SPIRIT) of his mouth.

The

The *breath* or spirit of the Lord's *mouth*, does undoubtedly mean the third person of the Trinity; who is called, *Job. xxxiii. 4. The Spirit of God and the Breath of the Almighty.* And it should here be remembered, that when Christ communicated the *Holy Ghost* to his disciples, he did it by *breathing* upon them⁴: a demonstration that *Christ* our Saviour, who, as a *person*, is the *word* of the Lord, is in *nature* the Lord *himself*; because the spirit or *breath* of the *Almighty* is also the *breath* of *Christ*.

XII.

Isa. xlviii. 16. And now the LORD GOD and his SPIRIT hath sent ME.

The speaker in this verse is no other than *Christ*, who at v. 12. calls himself *the first and the last*, and does here declare himself to be *sent*, not only by the *Lord God*, but also by his *Spirit*: which should be taken some notice of, because the *Arians* have objected to the co-equality of the *Son* with the *Father*, because he is said to be *sent* by him. But if this should hold, it will follow that *Christ* for the same reason, is also inferior to the *Spirit*. The author of an *Essay on Spirit*, whose violent proceedings in the Church have chiefly moved me to draw up these papers, is warm in the pursuit of this argument, that *Christ* is inferior to the Father, because he was *sent* by him. "We
" may therefore, says he, fairly argue, as our Saviour
" himself does upon another occasion—that as *the servant*
" *is not equal to his Lord, so neither is he that is sent*
" *equal to him that sent him*⁵." Not quite so fairly: for here is a gross misrepresentation, of which, and of many other things, this author should give us some account, before he proceeds any farther in the work of *reformation*; it being a maxim, I think, with the wise and learned, that a man should always reform *himself*, before he undertakes to reform the world. Upon the occasion he refers to, our Saviour has said—*The Servant is NOT GREATER than*

⁴ *John xx. 22.*⁵ P. 98.

*his Lord; neither is he that is sent GREATER than he that sent him*⁶. But in the place of this, he has ventured to substitute another reading that comes up to his point, and agrees better with the intended work of Reformation — “*he that is sent is not equal to him that sent him;*” printing the word *equal* in a different character to make it the more observable; and then puts an objection of his own forging into the mouth of our blessed Saviour. He professes himself a great enemy to *human compositions*: and we have reason to believe him, where those compositions are not *his own*. But his making so free with this and many other texts, does not look as if he was any great friend to the compositions of the *Holy Ghost*; and can do but little credit to a *Vindicator* of the *Holy Scripture* from the cavils and scoffs of an *Infidel*.

XIII.

Isa. xxxiv. 16. Seek ye out of the Book of the *Lord* and read—for *MY* mouth it hath commanded, and *HIS SPIRIT* it hath gathered them.

In these words, there is *one* person speaking of the *Spirit* of *another* person: so that the whole *Trinity* is here included. Whether God the *Father* or God the *Son* is to be understood as the speaker, it is neither easy nor material to determine. I am rather inclined to think it is the *former*.

XIV.

Num. vi. 24, &c.

The *LORD* bleſs thee and keep thee.

The *LORD* make his face to ſhine upon thee,
and be gracious unto thee.

The *LORD* lift up his countenance upon thee,
and give thee peace.

⁶ *John xiii. 16.*

After this form the High Priest was commanded to bless the children of Israel. The name of *the Lord*, in Hebrew *Jehovah*, is here repeated *three* times. And parallel to this is the form of Christian Baptism; wherein the three personal terms of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, are not represented as so many different names, but as one *name*: the one divine nature of God being no more divided by these three, than by the single name *Jehovah* thrice repeated. If the three articles of this benediction be attentively considered, their contents will be found to agree respectively to the three persons taken in the usual order of *the Father*, *the Son*, and *the Holy Ghost*. The *Father* is the author of *blessing* and *preservation*. Grace and *illumination* are from the *Son*, by whom we have *the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ*. *Peace* is the gift of the *Spirit*, whose name is *the Comforter*, and whose first and best *fruit* is the work of *Peace*.

Petrus Alphonsi, an eminent *Jew* converted in the beginning of the 12th Century, and presented to the font by *Alphonfus* a king of *Spain*, wrote a learned treatise against the *Jews*, wherein he presses them with this Scripture, as a plain argument that there are *three persons* to whom the great and *incommunicable* name of *Jehovah* is applied. And even the unconverted *Jews*, according to *Bechai*, one of their *Rabbies*, have a tradition, that when the high Priest pronounced this Blessing over the people—*elevatione manuum sic digitos composuit, ut Triadi exprimeret*—he lifted up his hands, and disposed his fingers into such a form as to express a Trinity. All the foundation there is for this in the Scripture, is *Lev. ix. 22.* as for the rest, be it a matter of fact or not, yet if we consider whence it comes, there is something very remarkable in it. See *Observ. Jos. de voif. in Pug. Fid.*

XV.

Matth. xxviii. 19. Baptizing them in the name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST.

XVI.

XVI.

2 *Thes.* iii. 5. The LORD (the *Holy Ghost*, see c. 2. art. 4. 48.) direct your hearts into the love of GOD (*The Father*) and into the patient waiting for CHRIST.

XVII.

2 *Cor.* xiii. 14. The grace of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and the love of GOD, and the communion of the HOLY GHOST.

In this and the foregoing article, the *order* of the *persons* is different from that of *Matth.* xxviii. 19. The Holy Ghost having the *first place* in the former of them, and Christ in the latter: Which is a sufficient warrant for that clause in the Creed of St. *Athanasius*—"In this Trinity, none is afore or after other." And Dr. *Clarke*, I presume, apprehended something of this sort; because he has corrected the Apostle, and transposed the order of the persons in 2 *Cor.* xiii. 14. without the least apology, or giving his reader any warning of it. §. LV. p. 377.

XVIII.

1 *John* v. 7. There are THREE that bear record in heaven, the FATHER, the WORD and the HOLY GHOST—

There has been much disputing about the authenticity of this text. I firmly believe it to be genuine for the following reasons. 1. St. *Jerom*⁷, who had a better opportunity of examining the true merits of the cause, than we can possibly have at this distance of time, tells us plainly, that he found out how it had been adulterated, mistranslated, and omitted on purpose to elude the truth. 2. The Divines of *Louvain* having compared many *Latin* copies, found this text wanting but in five of them; and

⁷ *Præf. ad Canon. Epist.*

R. Stephens found it retained in nine of sixteen antient manuscripts which he used. 3. It is *certainly* quoted twice by *St. Cyprian*², who wrote before the council of *Nice*: and also by *Tertullian*; as the reader is left to judge after he has read the Passage in the Margin³. *Dr. Clarke* therefore is *not to be believed* when he tells us, it was “never cited by any of the *Latins* before *St. Jerom*”⁴. 4. The Sense is not perfect without it; there being a contrast of three witnesses in heaven, to three upon earth; the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Holy Ghost*, whose testimony is called the *witness of God*; and the *Spirit*, the *water*, and the *blood*, which being administered by the Church upon earth, is called the *witness of men*. He that desires to see this text farther vindicated from the malice of *Faustus Socinus*, may consult *Pole's Synopsis*, and *Dr. Hammond*.

But even allowing it to be spurious, it contains nothing but what is abundantly asserted elsewhere; and that both with regard to the Trinity in general, and this their divine *Testimony* in particular. For that there are *three* divine persons who *bear record* to the Mission of *Christ*, is evident from the following Scriptures.

John viii. 17, 18. *The testimony of two men is true. I am ONE that bear witness of MYSELF.*

The FATHER that sent me beareth witness of me.

¹ *John* v. 6. *It is the SPIRIT that beareth witness.* And *Christ* has also mentioned, upon another occasion, a plurality of witnesses in heaven—We *speak* (says he) *that we do know, and testify that we have seen, and ye receive not OUR witness*⁵! which can be no other than the *witness* of the *Trinity*; because it is added—*no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven*; therefore no man could join with *Christ* in revealing the things of heaven to us.

² *De Unit. Eccl.* 109. *Epist.* lxxiii.

³ *Connexus patris in filio, & filii in paraceto, tres efficit coherentes, alterum ex altero; qui tres unum sunt, &c. adv. Prax.*

⁴ See the text in his 2d. Edition.

⁵ *John* iii. 11.

XIX.

Isa. vi. 3. And one cried unto another and said,
HOLY, HOLY, HOLY, is the LORD OF HOSTS.
See also *Rev.* iv. 8.

“ They are not content (says *Origen*) to say it *once* or
“ *twice*; but take the perfect number of the *Trinity*,
“ thereby to declare the manifold *holiness* of God; which
“ is a repeated intercommunion of a threefold holiness;
“ the holiness of the *Father*, the holiness of the only be-
“ gotten *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost* ².” And that the
Seraphim did really celebrate all the three persons of the
Godhead upon this occasion, is no conjecture, but a point
capable of the clearest demonstration.

The Prophet tells us, v. 1. *he saw the Lord sitting upon
a throne*; and at v. 5. that *his eyes had seen the king, the
Lord of Hosts*. Now if there be any phrase in the bible
to distinguish the true God, it is this of the *Lord of Hosts*.
I never saw it disputed by any *Arian* writer. The author
of an *Essay on Spirit* confesses it ³; and Dr. *Clarke* sup-
poses the name *Lord of Sabbath* (*Jam.* v. 4.) proper to the
Father only. So that in this *Lord of Hosts*, sitting upon his
Throne, there was the presence of *God the Father*.

That there was also the presence of *God the Son*, ap-
pears from *John* xii. 41. *These things said* *Esaïas*, *when
he saw his* (Christ's) *Glory, and spake of him* *.

And

² Non eis sufficit semel clamare sanctus, neque bis; sed
perfectum numerum Trinitatis assumunt, ut multitudinem
sanctitatis Dei manifestent; quæ est trinæ sanctitatis repetita
communitas; sanctitas patris, sanctitas unigeniti filii, & spir-
itus sancti.
Orig. Hom. in loc.

³ P. 65.

* It is written at v. 3—*Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts,
the whole earth is full of HIS GLORY*. This St. *John* has
affirmed to be the *glory of Christ*; but it was the glory of the
Lord of Hosts; Therefore Christ is the Lord of Hosts. And

And that there was the presence of *God the Holy Ghost*, is determined by *Acts* xxviii. 25. *Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the Prophet unto our Fathers, saying, &c.* then follow the words which the prophet affirms to have been spoken by the *Lord of Hosts*.

The text of *John* xii. 41. which being compared with this of *Isaiah*, proves the second person of the Trinity to be the *Lord of Hosts*, is evaded by Dr. *Clarke* in the following manner. "The *Glory* which *Isaias* saw, *Esai.* vi. 1. is plainly the glory of *God the Father*; whence the followers of *Sabellius* conclude, because St. *John* here calls it the *glory of Christ*, that therefore the Father and the Son are one and the same individual person²." It is concluded by the Orthodox of the Church of *England*, that the person of *Christ*, and the person of *God the Father*, are not one and the same individual person, but one and the same *Lord of Hosts*; because the Scripture, thus compared, hath affirmed them so to be; and THIS is the conclusion Dr. *Clarke* should have answered. But instead of *this*, he has produced the monstrous and impossible doctrine of *Sabellius*, that they are one and the same individual person, and answered *that*: which to be sure is easily done, and is quite foreign to the

if the parallel passage of *Rev.* iv. 8. be compared with this, it will appear (as it hath already Chap. 1. Art. XXIII.) that he is the *God Almighty* spoken of in that book. The Greek version of the LXX has it thus,

αγιος, αγιος, αγιος Κυριος σαββαθ.

In *Rev.* iv. 8. it is, αγιος, αγιος, αγιος, Κυριος ο Θεος ο παντοκρατωρ. whence it evidently appears that κυριος ο Θεος ο παντοκρατωρ is equivalent in the language of heaven to *Jehovah Sabbath*: therefore, as *Christ* is the *Lord of Hosts* of the old Testament, he is thereby proved *ipso facto* to be the *God Almighty* of the new. Which shews the weakness of those frequent remarks Dr. *Clarke* has bestowed upon the word παντοκρατωρ, as the great term of distinction between the person of *Christ* and that of *God the Father*.

purpose. The other conclusion, which is the only true and natural one, is kept out of sight, because it cannot be answered: and this of *Sabellius* is flurred upon his credulous Readers, as the doctrine of the *orthodox*, who disclaim and abhor it. This is no slander; for let any person read his book with a little circumspection, and he will soon find whom and what he would mean by the *followers* and *doctrine* of *Sabellius*. And let me give the reader the following caution, which he will find to be of great service in detecting the fallacious answers of the *Arian* writers in their controversies with the *orthodox*. Always be careful to examine whether they have replied to the proof *itself*, or to *something else* in the place of it. For when you have obtained any clear evidence from the Scripture, that two or more persons are one *God*, one *Lord*, &c. they will give a new face to your conclusion, by changing the terms *God* or *Lord*, which are the name of a *nature*, for that of a *person*, which can belong only to an *individual*. And then they shout for victory. O, say they, this man is a *Sabellian*! he believes *three persons* to be *one person*! But on the other hand, if you make it appear that in the Unity of the one *God* or *Lord* there are more persons than one, then they change the word *persons* for that of *Gods*: so that you are confuted this way also; and they cry you up for a *Tritheist*, a maintainer of *three Gods*! By the help of this artifice, Dr. *Clarke* attempted to deal with the *Scripture*; and the Author of an *Essay on Spirit* with the *Creeds* and *Liturgy* of the Church. And, though it be a matter scarce worth mentioning, thus also the Authors of a *monthly Review* have attempted to deal with *myself*. Some time ago I published a *full answer to the Essay on Spirit*, which had since been reprinted in *Ireland*, and I humbly hope may have done some little service. But when these Gentlemen had deliberated with themselves upon it for three or four months, it was retailed from their scandalous Shop as a system of *Tritheism*, *Sabellianism*, and what not. I hope God will forgive them! and this is all the answer I shall ever make to such men and such writers.

C H A P. IV. *The Trinity in Unity.*

If there be any diversity of nature, or any essential subordination in the persons of the Godhead, it must be revealed to us either in their *names*, or their *attributes*, or their *acts*; for it is by these only that they are or can possibly be made known to us in this Life. If the Scripture has made no difference in any of these, farther than that of a *personal* distinction (which we all allow) we are no longer to doubt that there is a natural or essential *Unity* in the three Persons of the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Holy Ghost*. It shall therefore be shewn in this Chapter, by a sort of proof more comprehensive than what has gone before, that these Persons have the same *Names*, the same *attributes*, the same counsel or *will*, and all concur, after an ineffable manner, in the same divine *Acts*: so that what the Scripture is falsely supposed to have ascribed to God in *one* Person, will appear to be ascribed by the same authority to God in *three* Persons. That therefore, these three persons are but *one God*; they are three distinct *agents*, yet there is but one and the same divine *agency*: or, as the church has more fully and better expressed it, that “that which we believe of the glory of the Father, “ the same we are to believe of the Son, and of the Holy “ Ghost, without any difference or inequality¹.”

I.

The Trinity in Unity is the *one Lord*, the *Creator* of the World.

Psal. xxxiii. 6. *By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath (Heb. Spirit, of his mouth. The whole Trinity therefore created the world: Yet this Trinity is but one Lord: For it is written.*

¹ Proper Preface upon the feast of Trinity.

Isa. xliv. 24. I am the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens ALONE, that spreadeth abroad the earth BY MYSELF. It follows therefore, either that the *word* and *spirit* did not make the heavens; or, that the *Father*, with his *word* and *spirit*, are the ALONE Lord and Creator of all things.

II.

The Trinity in Unity is the one Supreme Being or Nature, distinguished from all other Beings by the Name *Jehovah*. For the Scripture gives us the following position.

Deut. vi. 4. The Lord our God is ONE JEHOVAH: and again, *Psal. 83. Thou whose name ALONE is JEHOVAH, art the most high over all the earth.*

Yet *Christ* is *Jehovah*.

Jer. xxiii. 6. This is the name whereby he shall be called, JEHOVAH our righteousness.

So is the *Spirit* also.

Ezech. viii. 1. 3. The Lord JEHOVAH put forth the form of an hand and took me,—and the SPIRIT lift me, &c. see also CHAP. 2. Art. 4. and 24.

Therefore, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are the ONE *Jehovah*: they are three persons, yet have but *one name* and *one nature*. And it is the great advantage of this argument, that the Name *Jehovah* is not capable of any such equivocal interpretations as that of *God*; it has no plural; is incommunicable to any derived or created being; and is peculiar to the divine nature because, it is descriptive of it. The Author of an *Essay on Spirit* has endeavoured to avoid the force of this proof by pretending that there are *two Jehovahs*, one a distinct Being from the other. But in this he has exposed the cause he meant to defend, and left the argument in a worse state than he found it: for if there be *two*, then it is false that there is *a most high over all the earth, whose name ALONE is Jehovah*; and let him try if he can reconcile it. Dr. *Clarke* also pretends, in the Titles to two of his Sections, wherein the collection of texts is very numerous, to have set down the *Passages wherein it is declared* that the Second
and

and Third persons *derive their Being* (that is the expression he was not afraid to make use of) *from the Father*. But he has not produced one such passage; no such thing being *declared* in the whole bible; and the contrary to it is plainly revealed under this application of the name *Jehovah*.

III.

The Trinity in Unity is *the Lord* absolutely so called; in *Hebrew, Adonai*, in *Greek ο Κυριος*.

Rom. x. 12. † *The same LORD over all, is rich unto all that call upon him..*

Luke ii. 11. *A Saviour which is Christ the LORD.*

Rom. xi. 34. *For who hath known the mind of the LORD, or who hath been his counsellor? Which Lord, as we learn from the prophet whence it is quoted, is the Spirit: for it is written Isa. xl. 13. who hath directed the SPIRIT of the Lord, or being his counsellor hath taught him? That the person of the Spirit is the Lord, is also plain from 2 Cor. iii. 18. now the Lord is that Spirit—ο δεσποτης το Πνευμα εσιν—we are changed from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord; καθεκαρτο απο κυριου Πνευματος, as by the Lord the Spirit: which is all along to be understood of the personal Spirit, because the apostle begins expressly with that at the 3d verse of this chapter. And it was from the authority of these words—*The Lord is the Spirit*—added to those of v. 6.—*the Spirit giveth life*—that the council of Nice borrowed the following clause of its Creed—“ *I believe in the Holy Ghost, the LORD and GIVER OF LIFE.*”*

IV.

The Trinity in Unity is the *God of Israel*.

Matth. xv. 31. *The multitude glorified the God of Israel.*

† The Reader is desired to observe, that as I cannot in all cases fix upon a text that does precisely distinguish the *person* of the *Father*, I shall therefore be frequently obliged, as in this instance, to set a passage down in the *first* of the three ranks; that does confessedly denote the *true God*.

Luke

*Luke i. 16, 17. The children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord THEIR GOD: and he shall go before HIM**—that is before *Christ*.

2 *Sam. xxiii. 2, 3. The SPIRIT of the Lord spake by me—the GOD of ISRAEL said, &c.* So that unless he who spake was one being, and he that said was another, the Spirit is the God of Israel.

* *Dr. Clarke* allows that the word *him* means *Christ*, yet denies that he is intended by *the Lord their God*, which is the antecedent to it: and calls this a manner of speaking¹.

I No. 534.

V.

The divine Law, and consequently the authority whereupon it is founded, is that of a Trinity in Unity.

Rom. vii. 25. I myself serve the LAW of GOD.

*Gal. vi. 2. Fulfil the LAW of CHRIST.**

*Rom. viii. 2. The LAW of the SPIRIT of life.**

The divine Law then, is the law of God, Christ, and the Spirit of life. But it is written *Jam. iv. 12. There is ONE LAWGIVER who is able to save and to destroy: therefore, these THREE are ONE.* And here we have the true reason why the Scripture has represented the whole Trinity as tempted and resisted by the disobedience of man. For sin being the transgression of the Law, and the law being derived from the undivided authority of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, every breach of it is an offence against the Trinity: therefore it is written,

Deut. vi. 16. Thou shalt not TEMPT the LORD thy God.

1 Cor. x. 9.—neither let us TEMPT CHRIST.

Act. v. 9. How is it that ye have agreed together to TEMPT the SPIRIT of the Lord? for *Dr. Clarke's* opinion of this matter, see Ch. II. Art. XV.

** *Dr. Clarke* has left both these texts out of his collection; tho' he pretends to have set down all the highest Expressions relating to Christ and the Spirit.

VI. Th

VI.

The *mind* and *will* of God is the mind and will of a Trinity in Unity.

The *mind* of God.

1 Cor. ii. 16. *Who hath known the Mind of the Lord.*

Ibid.—*We have the MIND of CHRIST.*

Rom. viii. 27. *He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the MIND of the SPIRIT.*

The *will* of GOD.

1 *Theff.* iv. 3. *This is the WILL of GOD.*

Acts xxii. 14. *The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldst know HIS WILL.**

2 *Pet.* i. 21. *Prophecy came not in old time by the WILL of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the HOLY GHOST.*

* This passage is meant of *Christ* and of *his* will. *The God of our fathers* (said *Ananias*) hath CHOSEN thee, &c. but the person in God who appeared to *Ananias* and said of *Saul*, *he is a CHOSEN vessel unto ME*, was the Lord, even *Jesus*. *Acts* ix. 15. 17. For want of comparing the Scripture with itself, Dr. *Clarke* has set down the text of *Acts* xxii. 14. as a character of the *Father* only. No. 366.

VII.

The *Power* of God is the Power of a Trinity in Unity.

Eph. iii. 7. — *the grace of GOD given unto me, by the effectual working of HIS POWER.*

2 *Cor.* xii. 9. — *that the POWER of CHRIST may rest upon me.*

Rom. xv. 19. — *signs and wonders by the POWER of the SPIRIT of God..*

The Scripture therefore has ascribed divine power, and that in the same exercise of it (the *ministry* and *miracles* of *St. Paul*) to *Christ* and the *Spirit* in common with God the *Father*. So that when all glory and power is ascribed to the only wise God, what God can that be, but the Trinity? Upon this principle the Scripture is easily reconciled.
upon

upon any other it is unintelligible, as the reader may soon find by consulting Dr. *Clarke* and some other of the *Arian* writers; who to avoid this plain doctrine, have tried to amuse us with a religion made up of scholastic niceties and unnatural distinctions, which no man can understand, and which themselves are not agreed in, nor ever will be to the world's end. Yet they often dispute against us from the acknowledged *simplicity* of the Scripture!

VII.

The Trinity in Unity is *Eternal*.

Rom. xvi. 25, 26. The mystery—made manifest according to the commandment (αἰώνιος) of the EVERLASTING GOD.

*Rev. xxii. 13. I (Jesus) am the FIRST and the LAST.**

Heb. ix. 14.—who through (αἰώνιος) the EVERLASTING SPIRIT.

* Dr. *Clarke* allows these words, in *this place* to mean *Christ*, yet where the same words occur in *Rev. i. 8.* with the addition of the epithet *Almighty*, he denies it¹; though they are demonstrated to be spoken of the same person by the context and tenor of the whole chapter †: and he tells us, the character in one place *differs* from the other. So that upon his principle, the Scripture has revealed to us two different beings, both of whom are the *first and the last*, yet not *coeternal*. Which is sufficient of itself to justify all that was said above concerning his *distinctions*, &c. see Ch. I. Art. III.

IX.

— Is *True*.

John vii. 28. he that sent me is TRUE.

Rev. iii. 7. These things saith he—that is TRUE, he that hath the key of David, &c.

¹ *John v. 6. It is the Spirit that heareth witness, because the SPIRIT is TRUTH — η αληθεια THE truth.*

X.

¹ See No. 686. 414.
Art. XIX.

† See the Note at CH. III.

X.

—— is Holy.

Rev. xv. 4. *Who shall not fear thee, O LORD, and glorify thy Name? for THOU ONLY art HOLY.*

Acts iii. 14. *But ye denied THE HOLY ONE, and desired a murderer to be released unto you, &c. See also Dan. ix. 24. and Rev. iii. 7.*

I John ii. 20. *Ye have an unction from THE HOLY ONE; that is, an anointing from the Holy Ghost, who is called.*

John xiv. 26. *ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟ ΑΓΙΟΝ, The Spirit, the Holy one.*

XI.

—— Is omnipresent.

Jer. xxiii. 24. *Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the LORD?*

*Eph. i. 22—*the fulness of HIM (Christ) *that filleth all in all.*

Psal. cxxxix. 7, 8. *Whither shall I go then from thy SPIRIT?—If I go up into heaven Thou art there; if I go down into hell, THOU art there also.*

XII.

—— is the fountain of life.

*Deut. xxx. 20.—*love the LORD thy GOD, *for HE is thy LIFE.*

Col. iii. 4. *When CHRIST who is OUR LIFE shall appear, &c.*

Rom. viii. (10.) *The SPIRIT is LIFE.*

XIII.

The Trinity in Unity made all mankind.

Psal. c. 3. *The LORD he is GOD, it is HE that hath MADE US.*

John i. 3. *By HIM (Christ) were ALL THINGS MADE.*

Job. xxxiii. 4. *The SPIRIT of God hath MADE me.*

XIV.

—— quicken the dead.

John v. 21. *The FATHER raiseth up the dead and QUICKENETH them.* *Ibid*

Ibid.—even so the SON QUICKENETH whom he will.

Ibid. vi. 63. It is the SPIRIT that QUICKENETH.

XV.

——— instruct us in divine knowledge.

John vi. 45. They shall be all TAUGHT of GOD.

Gal. i. 12. Neither was I TAUGHT it but by the revelation of JESUS CHRIST.

John xiv. 26. The comforter, the holy SPIRIT will TEACH you all things.

XVI.

——— have fellowship with the faithful.

1 John i. 3. Truly our FELLOWSHIP is with the Father.—Gr. *Koinonia*.

1 John i. 3. And with his Son JESUS CHRIST.

2 Cor. xiii. 14. The FELLOWSHIP (*Koinonia*) of the HOLY GHOST be with you all.

XVII.

——— are spiritually present in the elect.

1 Cor. xiv. 25.—GOD is IN YOU of a truth.

2 Cor. xiii. 5. CHRIST is IN YOU except ye be reprobates.

John xiv. 17. The SPIRIT—dwelleth with you and shall be IN YOU.

So again.

2 Cor. vi. 16. GOD hath said, I will DWELL in them.

Eph. iii. 17. That CHRIST may DWELL in your hearts.

Rom. viii. 11. His SPIRIT that DWELLETH in you.

XVIII.

——— revealed to us the Divine Will.

Phil. iii. 15. GOD shall REVEAL even this unto you.

Gal. i. 12.—neither was I taught it but by the REVELATION of JESUS CHRIST.

Luke

Luke ii. 26. It was REVEALED unto him by the HOLY GHOST.

So again.

Heb. i. 1. GOD who SPAKE unto the fathers by the Prophets.

2 Cor. xiii. 3. Ye seek a Proof of CHRIST SPEAKING in me.

Mark xiii. 11. It is not ye that SPEAK, but the HOLY GHOST.

And as prophecies are revealed by, so are they also delivered in the name, that is, by the special authority of each person in the Godhead. For though the usual introduction to any divine revelation be—*Thus SAITH the LORD*—yet we also find the expressions—*These things SAITH the SON of GOD.* *Rev. ii. 18.* And—*Thus SAITH the HOLY GHOST.* *Acts xiii. 3.* with many other passages to the same effect.

XIX.

—— raised the Body of Christ from the grave.

*1 Cor. vi. 16. GOD hath both RAISED UP the Lord, and will also raise us up by his OWN POWER.**

John ii. 19. Destroy this temple and in three days I WILL RAISE IT UP.

1 Pet. iii. 18. Christ—being put to death in the flesh, but QUICKENED by the SPIRIT.

* See Art. VII. of this Chapter.

XX.

—— conduct the people of God.

Isai. xlviii. 17. I am the LORD thy GOD, which LEADETH thee by the way that thou shouldest go.

John x. 3. He (Christ the Shepherd) calleth his own sheep by name, and LEADETH them out.

Rom. viii. 14. As many as are LED by the SPIRIT of God, they are the sons of God.

XXI.

—— give a commission and authority to the ministers of the Gospel.

2 Cor.

C O N C L U S I O N.

97

2 Cor. iii. 5. 6. *Our sufficiency is of GOD, who hath MADE us able MINISTERS.*

1 Tim. i. 12. *JESUS CHRIST—counting me faithful, PUTTING me into the MINISTRY.*

Acts v. 28. Take heed therefore—to all the flock over the which the HOLY GHOST hath MADE you OVERSEERS.

XXII.

———sanctify the elect.

Jude i.—to them that are SANCTIFIED by GOD the FATHER.

Heb. ii. 11. HE that SANCTIFIETH and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren.

Rom. xv. 16. Being SANCTIFIED by the HOLY GHOST.

XXIII.

———perform all spiritual and divine operations.

1 Cor. xii. 16. *It is the same GOD which WORK-ETH ALL IN ALL.*

Col. iii. 11. CHRIST is all and IN ALL.

1 Cor. xii. 11. *But ALL these WORKETH that one and the self same SPIRIT.*

C O N C L U S I O N.

Let us now take a review of what has been collected in these papers, and sum up the evidence in its own natural terms.

It has appeared from the *first* Chapter, that *Christ Jesus*, whose Divinity is daily blasphemed amongst us, because it is supposed not to be proved in Scripture, is the *Lord of Hosts* ^a, the *first and the last* ^b, than whom there is *no greater* ^c, and beside whom there is *no God* ^d: that he is the *Saviour of the world* ^e, the *Lord and God* of the *holy Prophets* ^f and *Apostles* ^g, the *most high God* ^h, the *searcher of all hearts* ⁱ, comprehended and made known to us under the name of *that God* to whom *the world was reconciled* ^k. Who though he was the *Word* of God, that *came forth* from the Father into the world;

^a Chap. I. Art. I. II. III. ^b III. ^c XLV. ^d III.
^e IV. ^f V. ^g XI. ^h IX. ⁱ XLIII. ^k XIV,

yet he *was God*^l and of the same *divine nature*^m with him that sent him. Though he was perfect *man*, of the *seed* of *Abraham*, born of his mother, and in all things made like to his brethren; yet *the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily*ⁿ. Though he suffered, died^o, was pierced upon the Cross, and redeemed us by his *blood*; yet that blood was the blood of *God*^p, and upon *his* Cross *Je-hovah* was pierced^q.

That the objections urged against all these positive proofs, proceed wholly upon false principles; being drawn, partly, from *natural religion* and *Philosophy*, which never was nor ever will be subject to the *law of God*; and is not intended so to be by those who set it up and dispute for it. Partly, from the æconomical offices and humiliation of *Christ* in the *flesh*^r; in which it is nevertheless affirmed, that *God* himself was made *manifest*^s. And lastly, from the *unity*^t of *God* so often asserted and insisted upon in the Scripture; not in opposition to the Godhead of *Christ*, but to the *Idols*^u then worshipped all over the heathen world. Hence it is, that *God* is called the *true God*; for they were *false* ones: *one God*; for they were *many*^w: the *living God*^x; for they were *vanities* without life. Yet in the place of these *idols*, who are to supply the contrast, they have substituted the person of their blessed Redeemer, the *true God*^y, the *everlasting Father*^z, the *Lord of Glory*^a, who is able to *subdue all things to himself*, and of whose *kingdom* there shall be *no end*.

From the *second* Chapter it has appeared, that the *Holy Ghost* is our spiritual *Father*^b, by whose divine power we are *begotten* to a new life; and to whom we daily *pray* that he would not *lead us into temptation*^c. That he is the *Lord*^d, even the *Lord of hosts*^e, the ruler of the Christian æconomy, *calling* men to that *honour* in his church, which *God only*^f can bestow upon them. That he is in-

l XIX. m XLIV. n XVIII. o XLVII.
 p XLVIII. q XLIX. r XXV. XXVI. XXXIX.
 s 1 Tim. iii. 16. t XXIV. XXXIII. u XXII. 1 John
 v. 21. w 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6. x Acts. xiv. 15. y 1 John
 v. 20. z XX. a 1 Cor. ii. 8. b Ch. II. Art. I. c XI.
 d III. e XXII. f II.

comprehensibly *united* with *God*, and sensible of the omnipotent *will* in himself; *even as* the human *Spirit* is united to *man*, and understandeth its *own thoughts* ¹. That *his power*, is the immediate power of *God himself* ²; his *inspiration*, is the inspiration of *God* ³; his *presence*, the presence of *God* ⁴. That he is *God* ⁵, even the *highest*; for the *man* Christ Jesus, who is the *Son of God* and the *Son of the highest*, was *so called*, BECAUSE he was begotten of the *Holy Ghost* ⁶.

That the objections usually brought to disguise and destroy this evidence, are taken from the *unity*, the *attributes* and *will* of *God*, and the *ministration* of the *Spirit* in the œconomy of grace; all of them falsely interpreted ⁷. For as to the *unity* of *God*, it is not an unity of *person*. As to the supreme attribute of *goodness*, it is also possessed by the *Spirit*. As to the *Will* of *God*, according to which the gifts and graces of the *Spirit* are distributed, it is opposed to the will of *man*, not to that of the *Spirit*; which is said to blow *where it listeth*, and to divide or distribute unto every man his gifts, not as *man* the receiver, but as he himself *willeth* ⁸.

It has appeared from the *third* Chapter, that *God* is signified to us throughout the old Testament by a name that is *plural* ⁹, and proved to be such from many particular instances; yet generally so restrained and qualified, as to destroy the suspicion of a plurality of *Gods*. That to this common name of *God*, many other plural names and expressions are added ¹⁰; and that an interchanging of the *plural* and *singular* ¹¹ is frequently observed, which neither grammar nor reason can account for upon any principle, but that of a real divine plurality. That the *persons* of *God* are *three* in number, precisely distinguished on some occasions by the personal names of *the Father*, the *Word* or *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit* ¹², and also by different offices. That the same term is not always peculiar

¹ XIII. ² XVII. ³ VI. ⁴ IX. V. XX. ⁵ VIII.
⁶ XXI. ⁷ XXII. XXIV. ⁸ XXV. ⁹ Chap. III.
 Art. I. ¹⁰ V. VI. VII. VIII. ¹¹ IX. X. ¹² Chap. XVIII.

and proper to the same person; because the words *God*, *Lord Jehovah*, and *Father*, are sometimes applied to one person, sometimes to another; while at other times they are not personal, but general names of the *divine nature*. That in the *Lord of Hosts* ¹, sitting upon his throne, and speaking of himself in the *plural* to the Prophet *Isaiah*, there was not *one* person only, but *three*; The *Father*, *Jesus*, and the *Holy Ghost*, all expressed under one name in the old Testament, but personally distinguished to us by three different ones in the new, where this matter is referred to.

In the *fourth* and last Chapter, the passages of the Scripture have been laid together, and made to unite their beams in one common center, the *Unity* of the Trinity. Which unity is not metaphorical and figurative, but strict and real: and there can be no real unity in God, but that of his *nature*, *essence*, or *substance*, all of which are synonymous terms: this unity considered *in itself*, is altogether incomprehensible: but it is one thing to read and to know that there *is* a divine nature, and another thing to *describe* it. That it is proved to be an unity of essence; 1st. because the three persons are all comprehended under the same individual and supreme appellation. They are the one *Lord* absolutely so called ², the *Creator of the World*, and the *God of Israel* ³. 2dly, because they partake in common of the name *Jehovah* ⁴, which being interpreted means the *divine Essence*; and what it signifies in one person, it must also signify in the others; as truly as the singular name *Adam*, in its appellative capacity, expresses the common nature of all mankind. And this name neither is nor can be communicated, without a contradiction, to any derived or inferior nature, as well on account of its signification as its application, which is expressly restrained to *one only*. 3dly, It is farther proved, in that the *authority* ⁵, the secret *mind* ⁶ or counsel, and the *power* ⁷ by which all things are estab-

¹ XIX. ² Chap. IV. Art. I. III. ³ IV. ⁴ II.
⁵ V. ⁶ VI. ⁷ VII.

lished and directed, is ascribed to *Christ* and the *Spirit* in common with God the Father; and that in the same exercise of it, and upon the same occasions. 4thly, because there is a participation of such divine *attributes* ¹ as cannot subsist but where they are original. Our understanding, if it be moderately instructed, will satisfy us there can be *one only* who is *eternal*, and possessed of *holiness, truth, life, &c.* in and from himself. Yet the whole Trinity is *eternal, holy, true, living* and *omnipresent*: therefore these *three* were and will be *one God* from everlasting to everlasting. 5thly and lastly, because there is a concurrence of the whole undivided Godhead in all those *acts* ², every one of which have in them the character of a divine wisdom and omnipotence; and express such an intimate union and communion of the Holy Trinity, as the understanding of man cannot reach, and which no words can explain. For though it is and must be *one God* who doth all these things, yet it is *the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit*, who gave us our being, instruct and illuminate us, lead us, speak to us, and are present with us; who give *authority* to the church, raise the dead, sanctify the elect, and perform every divine and spiritual operation.

This is the God revealed to us in the holy Scripture; very different from the *Deity* so much talked of in our systematical schemes of *natural* divinity; which with all its wisdom, never yet thought of a *Christ* or an *Holy Ghost*, by whom *nature*, now fallen and blinded, is to be reformed, exalted and saved. The Bible we know to be the infallible word of God; the rule of our faith and obedience. I find this doctrine revealed in it; therefore I firmly believe and submit to it. And as the Liturgy of the Church of *England* hath affirmed the same in all its offices, and contains nothing contradictory thereto, I believe *that* also; and hope the God whom we serve will defend it against all attempts toward reforming *Christianity* out of it: that the Church militant here in Earth, may

¹ VIII. IX. X. XI. XII.

² XIII. &c. ad fin.

continue to agree in this fundamental doctrine with the Church triumphant in heaven. For there the Angels *rest not day and night*, praising this *Thrice-Holy*¹ blessed and glorious Trinity. They have neither time nor inclination to dispute against that Glory, which they cannot steadfastly behold. And had we a little more humility and devotion, we should not abound so much with disputation. If, in such a subject as this, we trust to our own reason, and it should prove at last to have betrayed us into error, irreligion, and blasphemy, what shall we have to say in excuse for ourselves? we shall not dare to plead the dignity and strength of our rational faculties before the tribunal of Him, who came into the world to bring the wisdom of it to nought. And if the Religion of *Jesus Christ* is to be corrected and softened till it becomes agreeable to the natural thoughts and imaginations of the human heart, then in vain was it said—*Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me.*

As for him who is convinced that God is wiser than himself; who *believes as* he ought, and as the Catholic Church of Christ hath given him an example from the beginning; *his* danger lies on the other side: and while I venture to give him warning of it, *I beseech him to suffer the word of exhortation*, and to take in good part the *faithful words of a friend*. Let him take care then, that while he values his orthodoxy, he be not led unawares to *overvalue* it, by drawing false conclusions from it, and conceiting himself to be *already perfect*. If he knows and believes in the true God, he doth well: but let not that which is an honour to him be any encouragement to dishonour God; the knowledge of whom will only serve to encrease our condemnation, if we live in any *lust of concupiscence, even as the Gentiles who knew him not*. And though it be the *faith* of a Christian, and not his *morality*, that distinguishes him from the rest of mankind; yet that faith must appear in the conduct of his life; even as love to a friend is best witnessed by a readiness to do him ser-

¹ Chap. III. Art. XIX.

vice. It is true, the service is not the love, nor of equal value with it; yet the love that refuses the service will be accounted as nothing. The *mystery of faith* is an invaluable treasure; but the vessel that contains it must be clean and undefiled; it must be *held in a pure conscience*; as the *manna*, that glorious symbol of the *word of faith* preached to us by the Gospel, was confined to the Tabernacle, and preserved in a vessel of gold. A mind that is conformed to this world, and given up to its pleasures though it repeat the Creed without questioning a single article of it, will be abhorred in the sight of God, as a vessel unfit for the master's use; and unworthy, because unprepared, to stand in the *most holy place*. It is the great excellence of faith, that it can produce such a transformation in the life and manners, as no other principle has any Power to do; and many are possessed of this truth, without applying it to their own advantage. It is to be feared that a consciousness of this damps their Zeal, and creates that poor, pitiful, cowardly indifference so much in vogue; which if it had not by accident found the name of *charity*, would have been ashamed to shew its face in a christian country. They are cold and backwards to promote any religious conversation; they will not appear to be in earnest about their faith in the eyes of the world, lest they should be forced to abridge somewhat from the gaiety of their lives, and to *live* as they *speak*. But let them remember, that *without holiness no man shall see the Lord*: no dross nor impurity of this world will be suffered to continue in his sight. And in this he is no hard master, *reaping* where he hath not *sown*, and requiring the fruit of good works without giving us strength and ability to bring them forth. He has provided for us the precious blood of the Lamb, and offered to us the assistance of his holy Spirit, that we may be enabled to *serve* that living God in whom we *believe*. If we are purged by *him*, we shall be clean: if *he* washes us, we shall be *whiter than snow*: and when the kingdom of God shall come, and his glory

shall appear, we shall be prepared to *behold his face in righteousness.*

This and no other, is my sincerest wish and prayer for every Christian, who shall give himself the trouble to peruse these papers; in which I pretend to no merit but that of a *transcriber*; which I shall always esteem to be honour enough, where the word of God is my original. And if they should be any way instrumental to promote so good an end, he will not have read, nor shall I have written in vain.

Texts

Texts explained and enlarged upon in the preceding Work.

GENESIS			PSALMS		
CHAP.	VERSE	PAG.	CHAP.	VERSE	PAG.
i	1	72	xiv	3	36
	26	73	xxiii	1	27
iii	15	45	xxxiii	6	79 & 88
	22	73	lviii	12	75
vi	3	62	lxviii	17, 18	53
xi	6, 7	74	lxxviii	25	77
xv	1	50		56	27
xvii	1	ib.	c	3	28 & 94
	22	42	cx	1	79
xix	24	79	cxii	5	66
xx	13	74	cxxxii	2	77
xxv	7	75	cxxxix	7	64
xlix	24	77		7, 8	94
	NUMBERS		cxliii	10	66
vi	24	81		PROVERBS	
	DEUTERONOMY		ix	10	76
iv	7	75	xxx	3	ib.
vi	4	89		4	79
	16	61 & 91		ECCLESIASTES	
xxx	20	94	v	8	76
xxxii	17	71	xii	1	ib.
	JOSHUA			ISAIAH	
xxiv	19	75	ii	17, 18	32
	JUDGES		vi	3	85
xv	14	67		5	24
xvi	20	ib.	vi	8	65 & 74
	2 SAMUEL		viii	13, 14	23
vii	23	75	ix	6	32 & 44
xxiii	2, 3	91	x	12	79
	I KINGS		xiii	13	ib.
viii	39	49	xxii	19	ib.
	JOB		xxxiv	16	81
xxxiii	4	80 & 94	xl	10	55
				ISAIAH	

I N D E X.

ISAIAH			MATTHEW		
CHAP.	VERSE	PAG.	CHAP.	VERSE	PAG.
	13	73 & 90	iii	11	26
xlvi	11	24		16	66
xliv	6	<i>ib.</i>	iv	1	59
	24	89		7	61
xl	23	39 & 52	viii	2	40
xlvi	16	80	ix	38	56
	16	<i>ib.</i>	xi	10	26
	17	96	xii	28	62
li	13	76	xiii	52	68
liv	5	28 & 76	xv	31	90
lxiv	4	79	xix	17	34 & 65
	JEREMIAH		xx	23	41
xxiii	6	32 & 89	xxii	43	36
	24	94	xxiii	9	43
xxxi	28	77		10	43
	EZEKIEL		xxviii	19	82
viii	1, 3	63 & 89		MARK	
	DANIEL		ii	7	35
iv	17	77	vi	5	42
v	26	<i>ib.</i>	xiii	11	96
	18	78		32	45
	20	<i>ib.</i>		LUKE	
ix	17	79	i	16, 17	26 & 91
	24	94		32	64
	HOSEA			33	37
i	7	26 & 79		35	64
xi	12	76		68, 70	64
	HABAKKUK			76	25
i	11	71	ii	11	90
	ZECHARIAH			26	56 & 96
ii	10, 11	79		28	56
x	12	<i>ib.</i>		52	45
xii	4	54	v	21	36
	10	<i>ib.</i>	viii	28	64
	MALACHI		xi	2, 4.	59
i	6	76		20	62
iii	1	26	xx	36	44
				JOHN	

I N D E X.

JOHN			JOHN		
CHAP.	VERSE	PAG.	CHAP.	VERSE	PAG.
i	1	32		16	28
	3	95		17	46
	4, 7, 8, 9.	60		ACTS	
	13	57	iii	14	94
	18	46	iv	24, 25.	63
ii	19	96	iv	29, 30.	40
iii	6	55	v	3, 4.	57
	11	84		9	61 & 91
	13	43		28	42
	16	40	viii	16	78
	29	27	ix	15, 17.	92
iv	24	60		34	41
	42	25	x	40	40
v	21	94		42	39
vi	31, 33.	77		48	78
	38	40	xi	24	66
	45	57 & 95	xiii	2	55
	63	95		3	96
vii	28	93		4	56
viii	12	60	xvii	31	39
	17, 18.	84	xx	28	54
x	3	28 & 96	xxii	14	92
	6	27	xxviii	25	64 & 86
xi	25	44		26, 27.	65
xii	41	24 & 86		ROMANS	
xiii	16	81	i	I	55
xiii	32	60		29	57
xiv	8, 9.	46	vii	25	91
	11	31 & 60	viii	2	91
	17	57 & 95		10	94
	26, 60, 94 &	95		11	96
	28	44		14	59 & 96
xvii	5	46		26	67
xix	37	54		27	92
xx	22	80		29	38 & 46
	28	28 & 42	ix	5	29
xxi	1	40	x	12	90
				ROMANS	

I N D E X.

ROMANS			EPHESIANS		
CHAP.	VERSE	PAG.	CHAP.	VERSE	PAG.
xi	34	73 & 90		7	92
xiv	10, 11.	39 & 52		17	95
xv	16	97	iv	8	53
	19	92		30	62
xvi	25, 26.	93		32	40
I CORINTHIANS			v	25	40
ii	11	60 & 61		27	49
	13	57	PHILIPPIANS		
	14	61	i	10	54
	16	92	ii	9	25
iii	16	59	iii	15	95
vi	16	96		20	47
	19	59		21	47
viii	6	42	COLOSSIANS		
x	9	27 & 91	ii	8, 9.	32
xi	3	45	iii	4	94
xii	11	67 & 97		11	97
	16	97		13	40
xiv	25	57 & 95	I THESSALONIANS		
xv	24	37	iv	3	92
	27	46		8	57
2 CORINTHIANS			2 THESSALONIANS		
i	3	59	iii	5	83
iii	5, 6.	97	I TIMOTHY		
	17, 18.	90	i	1	55
v	19	30		12	97
	20	31	iii	16	46
vi	16	95	2 TIMOTHY		
xii	9	92	iii	16	57
xiii	3	96	TITUS		
	5	95	ii	13	29
	14	83 & 95	HEBREWS		
GALATIANS			i	1	70 & 96
i	12	49 & 95	ii	4	67
vi	2	91		11	97
EPHESIANS			iii	14	50
i	22	94	v	4	55
iii	2, 3.	49	HEBREWS		

I N D E X.

HEBREWS			I JOHN		
CHAP.	VERSE	PAG.	CHAP.	VERSE	PAG.
vi	13	52		24	58
ix	14	93	v	4	55
	16	53		6 60, 84, &	93
	20	53		7	83
	JAMES			20	31
iv	12	91		21	94
v	4	85		JUDE	
	I PETER			I	97
ii	7, 8	23		4	48
iii	18	96		24, 25	48
	20	62		REVELATION	
v	2, 4	28	i	8	33
	2 PETER		ii	18	96
i	I	29		23	50
	4	50	iii	7	94
	21	57 & 92		21	42
ii	I	48	iv	8	85
iii	12	54	v	9	48, & 54
	18	25	xv	4	94
	I JOHN		xxi	7	44
i	3	94	xxii	6	25
	5	60		12	55
ii	20	94		13	24 & 93
iii	21	58		16	25

F I N I S.

B  L

90100050

